

Modern Philology

VOL. XI

July 1913

No. 1

CONCERNING MS. 2-G-5 OF THE PALACE LIBRARY AT MADRID

Ms. 2-G-5 of the Palace Library at Madrid contains besides other Spanish works a *Libro de Josep Abarimatia, e otrosi Libro del Sancto Grial que es el escodilla en que comio Jesu Cristo* (f. 251-282), an *Estoria de Merlin e cuyo fijo fue*. ¶ *E del rrey Artus e de como gano la Grand Bretaña que se dize Inglaterra* (f. 282^v-296), and a fragmentary *Lançarote* (f. 298^v-300^v). I purpose to discuss first the relation of these texts (G) to:

El Baladro¹ del sabio Merlin con sus Profecias. Burgos, 1498 (Gallardo 1,950 no. 931). Extracts in *Merlin* . . . p. . . . p. G. Paris et J. Ulrich, 1 (1886) Lxxxi. (B).

¹ A *Libro del Valadro de Merlin* is cited in a Ms. of the *Crónica General de 1404* about which Menéndez Pidal, *Revista de Archivos* 9 (1903) 34, gives details. The passage in question (p. 37) reads: "De las prophecias del Menlin. En este tenpo prophetizaua Merlin en Inglaterra et dezia las cosas que aviam de venir, et dixo a Vitiger que se non podria gardar de los fijos del rrey Costancio que ellos lle darian mala fim. Quien esto bien quisiere saber leya el libro del *Valadro de Merlin* . . ." (Ms. Esc. X-1-8: lea el libro debia obra de Merlin.).

I quote further the concluding lines of Menéndez' article (p. 55): "En resumen: un portugués, en los años 1403 y 1404, reunió en un volumen una historia desde el comienso hasta Ramiro I, que probablemente existía con anterioridad, y una compilación portuguesa, seguramente anterior al siglo XV, desde Ramiro I á San Fernando, formada con la traducción de dos trozos de crónicas castellanas. Al conjunto de estas dos partes le añadió una interpolación de la *Conquista de Ultramar*, y una continuación de los reyes sucesores de San Fernando hasta Enrique III. En estas dos adiciones: en la interpolación y en la continuación, dejó el autor la fecha de su trabajo y la memoria de su estancia en Castilla en 1390. El autor (más bien que un amanuense) empezó á escribir en castellano su obra, copiando los textos castellanos que segufa; pero luego se cansó y escribió en portugués. En una copia posterior, Esc. X-1-8, la obra fué reducida toda al lenguaje castellano."

[*La Demanda¹ del Sancto Grial con los maravillosos Fechos de Lançarote y de Galaz su Hijo.*] Toledo, 1515. Only the "segundo y postrero libro" of this edition has been preserved (Sommer, *Romania* 36 [1907] 372). Extracts in Sommer, *The Queste of the Holy Grail*, *Romania* 36, 545. (*D*² 1515.)

La Demanda del Sancto Grial con los maravillosos Fechos de Lançarote y de Galaz su Hijo. Sevilla, 1535. Reprinted by Bonilla, *Libros de Caballerías* 1 (1907) 3. (*D* [resp. *D*¹, *D*²] 1535.)

I then place side by side some selections from *D*² 1515 and *D*² 1535:

(a) Vispera de pentecoste acacio que fue muy gran gente asonada en camaloc assi que podian ay ver muchos caualleros y muchas dueñas muy bien guar-nidas y el Rey que era muy ledo honro los muchos y fizo los mucho bien seruir y toda cosa que entendia que por su corte seria mas leda y mas viciosa todo lo hacia.

(a) Aqui comienza el segundo libro dela Demanda del Sancto Grial; e de los fechos del muy esforçado Galaz.

En la vispera de pentecostes, acacio que fue muy gran gente juntada en Camaloc, assi que podian ay ver muchos caualleros, e muchas dueñas muy bien guar-nidas; y el rey, que estaua muy alegre, honrolos mucho, e fizolos mucho bien seruir. E toda cosa que entendia que por su corte seria mas alegre e mas viciosa, todo lo hazia.

¹ I incline to see an allusion to a Ms. of this work in the well-known lines of *C. Baena* (1851) 368:

En la grand demanda del Santo Greal
Se leo de muchos que assy andudieron,
Syempre por ty (ac. amor mundanal) pasando grant mal,
Pesaros e coyias, que al non ovieron:
Assas cavalleros e dueñas morieron,
Tan bien otro ay fermosas donsellas,
Sus nonbres non digo dellos nin dellas,
Que por sus ystorias sabrás quales fueron.

The *decir* to which these lines belong has been attributed to Diego Martínez (*C. Baena* 367), to Fernán Sánchez Talavera (*C. Baena* 598), and to Juan Rodríguez de la Cámara (Paz y Mélla, *Opúsculos lit.* 367). As long as the question was between the first two, Menéndez y Pelayo favored Diego Martínez (*Antología* 4 [1893] LXXVI). Later (*Antología* 5 [1894] CCXXIII) he leaves the question open. Still later (*Antología* 12 [1906] 462) he fathers the *decir* on Fernán Sánchez Talavera, without mentioning the claims of the two others. Baist (Gröbers *Grundr.* 2, II, 438 note 6) considers Diego Martínez as the author and thinks that the *decir* was written "ungefähr im 1. Viertel des 15. Jh."

Finally, the fact is worth mentioning that "En la biblioteca de la fortaleza de Benavente, por los años de 1440, estaba la *Bravía cumplida en romance con un poco del libro de Merlin*" (Clemencia, *Memorias R. Ac. Hist.* 6 [1821] 459 n. 2); and that the library of Queen Isabella contained (nos. 142-144): "Otro libro de pliego entero de mano escripto en romance, que se dice de *Merlin*, . . . e había de *Josepe ab Arimathea*.—Otro libro de pliego entero de mano en romance, que es la *tercera parte de la demanda del santo Grial* . . . —Otro libro de pliego entero de mano en papel de romance, que es la *historia de Lanceslots* . . ." (Clemencia, *op. cit.* 459.)

(b) 36. De los ciento y cinquenta caualleros que fueron de la tabla redonda que hizieron el juramento desta demanda: El primero Galaz el .ij. lançarote despues Tristan y Boores de gaunes: y Lioner: y Estor Mares y Briures Blamor su hermano y Layn el blanco Bafa afijado del rey van: agon buen cauallero a marauilla Tristan Arnel canir Gariendes el negro Acosan el gruseo Acotan el ligero Danubre el corajoso. Todos estos caualleros sin Tristan eran del linaje del rey Van . . . y los otros que del rey no eran fueron estos. Aglouan y perseual: tor fijo de dares: madar su primo cormano: y persides de galaz. E los otros Erec fijo del rey Lac: gugeran su hermano de guancho muy ben cauallero de armas: mas tan soberuio que era marauilla.

(b) Cap. XXXVI.—*De los nombres de los ciento e cinquenta caualleros de la Mesa Redonda.*

De los ciento e cinquenta caualleros que fueron de la Mesa Redonda, que fizieron el juramento desta demanda: El primero Galaz; el segundo Lançarote; e despues Tristan, e Boores de Gaunes, e Lioner, y Estor Mares, e Briures, Blamor su hermano, e Layn el blanco; Bafa, ahijado del rey Vamagon, buen cauallero a marauilla; Tristan, Arnel, Canir, Gariendes el negro, Acosan el grueso,¹ Acotan el ligero, Danubre el corajoso. Todos estos caualleros, sin Tristan, eran del linaje del rey Van . . . y los otros que del reyno eran, fueran estos: Aglouan, e Perseul; Tor, fijo de Dares; Madar, su primo cormano; e Persides de Galaz. E los otros: Erec, fijo del rey Lac; Gugeran, su hermano de Guancho, muy buen cauallero de armas, mas tan soberuio, que era marauilla.

(c) 454. Estonce metio mano ala espada E quando el arçobispo vio que los queria matar metio se antel golpe y diole al [text: el] rey a tan gran herida que lo echo muerto en tierra. E quando paulos que ay estaua esto vio yrguiose en pie y dixo. y (sic?) rey Mares falso y desleal tu feziste a mi tal traycion qual nunca otro rey fizo. E has fecho tan gran maldad de matar a tal hombre como este: mas si dios quisiere tu te hallaras ende mal si yo puedo: estonce metio mano Paulos al espada y dexose yr contra el rey Mares y como estaua con tan gran saña yera de gran fuerça

(c) Cap. CCCCLV.—*Como el rey Mares mato al arçobispo de Conturbel.*

Estonce metio mano a la espada. E quando el arçobispo vio que los queria matar, metiose antel golpe, e diole el rey tan gran ferida, que lo echo muerto en tierra. Y quando Paulos que ay estaua esto vio, yrguiose en pie, e dixo: "¡E rey Mares falso e desleal! Tu heziste a mi tal traycion qual nunca otro rey fizo. Y has hecho tan gran maldad de matar a tal hombre como este: mas, si Dios quisiere, tu te fallaras ende mal si yo puedo." Estonce metio mano Paulos al espada, e dexose yr contra el rey Mares, e como estaua con gran saña y era de gran fuerça,

¹ El texto: "gruseo."

² A "verschlimmbesserung."

firio lo a tan brauamente que no le valio nada el almofar ni el ganbax que no le metiese el espada fasta los puños y dio con el muerto en tierra . . . E assi como vos digo murio el rey mares. Esus hombres anduieron lo buscando y nunca supieron que fuera del y los hermitaños quedaron en la hermita seruiendo a dios y a sancta maria. E vuieron buenos acabamientos en este mundo. E despues fueron las animas ante la faz de nuestro señor iesu christo do el y su sancta madre biuen onde atodos nos dexe entrar por la su sancta merced y piedad y merescientes seamos a la gloria onde los justos y los buenos para siempre moran. Amen. Laus deo.

fisiolo tan brauamente, que no le valio nada el almofar ni el ganbax que no le metiese el espada fasta los puños. Y dio con el muerto en tierra . . . e assi como os digo murio el rey Mares; e sus hombres anduieronlo buscando, e nunca supieron que fuera del; e los hermitaños quedaron en la hermita seruiendo a Dios e a sancta Maria. E vuieron buenos acabamientos en este mundo. E despues fueron las animas ante la faz de Nuestro Señor Jesu Christo, do el e su santa madre biue; onde a todos nos dexe entrar; por su santa merced, e piedad, e merescimientos, seamos en la gloria, donde los justos e los buenos para siempre moran. Amen.

In general, *D*² 1535 as compared with *D*² 1515, shows modernized forms (a:juntada—asonada, alegre—ledo, honro—honro; b:ahijado—afijado; c:heziste—feziste, hecho—fecho, os—vos); otherwise the agreement extends even to misprints¹ (b:Acosan el gruseo). We may safely assume the same conformity between *D*¹ 1535 and *D*¹ 1515.

It looks then as if *D* Sevilla, 1535, had been printed from *D* Toledo, 1515. But it seems more probable to me that both follow "*Merlin, y demanda del Santo Grial*. Hispali 1500. in folio" (Antonio, *Bibl. Hisp. Nova* 2, 400 b).²

Further, I compare extracts from *B* with similar ones from *D*¹ 1535:

Cap. XXXVIII. *De como Baudemagus iba con la doncella que tomó á Morlot, é con un su escudero.*

Un poco despues de hora de nona dió Merlin un grand baladro é un gemido tan espantoso que Baudemagus huvo grand miedo. E á cabo de una pieza fabló no en voz de hombre mas de

Cap. CCCXXXVII.—*De las espantosas palabras que dezia Merlin ante de su muerte.*

Vn poco despues de hora de nona, dio Merlin vn baladro grande e vn gemido tan espantoso, que Bandemagus vuo muy gran miedo, e a cabo de vna pieça hablo muy espantosamente,

¹ merescimientos, *D*² 1535 c is a misprint of this latter edition which Bonilla like many others should have corrected.

However for *acacio*, *D*¹ 1515 a—honro los muchos, lb.—del rey no eran, lb. b—my *ben cauallero*, lb., Sommer's bad proofreading is most likely responsible.

² Thus also Brugger, *Zeitschr. f. franz. Sprache* 34, I (1909) 120 n. 26.

diablo, e dixo: "Ay! mala criatura, é vil é fea é espantosa de ver é de oyr, mal aventurado de mal fazer, que ya fuiste flor de beldad é ya fuiste en la bendita silla en la gloria celestial con todo bien conplido, criatura maldita é de mala parte, desconocida é soberbia, que por tu orgullo quiesiste ser en lugar de Dios, é por ende fuiste derribado con tu mezquina é cativa compañía, é tiróte del lugar de alegría é plazer por tu culpa, é metióte en tiniebra é en cuyta, que te non fallescerá en ningund tiempo, é esto has tu por tu gran soberbia!"
 E quando Baudemagus esto oyó, fué tan espantado que no supo que fiziese, é signóse muchas veces de las grandes maravillas que oia, e dixo entre sí: "Desde hoy más me quiero ir de aquí." E luego tornó de otro acuerdo é dixo: "Por cierto no lo faré, antes quiero esperar de qué manera finará Merlin." E él así estando antel monumento, vino un gran trueno é pedrisco é tan grand soñlydo espantoso é tan grand escuridad, que no vió ni punto más que si fuese noche oscura, aunque era un poco ante de nona. E oyó en la casa vuelta é alborozo tan grande como si estoviesen allí mil hombres, é que diese cada uno las mayores voces que pudiese, é havia entre ellas muchas voces feas é espantosas, de las quales Baudemagus hubo grand miedo, que no se pudo tener en los pies, é parecióle que le fallescia el corazon, é que toda la fuerza del cuerpo le menguaba, é cayó atordido en tierra, é muy sin virtud, que creyó luego ser muerto, tanto hubo grand miedo. É él así yaziendo en tierra, oyó un baladro tan grande como si mil hombres diesen voces todos á una, é entre todas havia una voz tan grande que sonaba sobre

e no en boz de hombre, mas de diablo, e dixo: "¡Ay mala criatura, engañosa é vil, e fea, e maldita, y espantosa de ver e de oyr en tal auenturado e de mal son,¹ que ya fueste flor de beldad é fueste en la bendita silla y en la yglesia² celestial con toda alegría e con todo bien conplidamente! ¡criatura maldita, e de mala parte, y desconocida e soberuia, que por tu orgullo quiso esto ser³ en lugar de Dios, e por ende fueste derribado con cativa e mezquina compañía! ¡e quitote del lugar de alegría e de plazer por tu culpa y merito⁴ en tiniebras y en cuyta, que nunca te fallecera en ningun tiempo! Y esto has tu ganado por tu orgullo e soberuia"

Cap. CCCXXXVIII.—*Del gran baladro que dió Merlin, e de como murió.*

Quando Bandemagus esto oyo, fue tan espantado, que no supo que hazer; santiguose muchas veces de las grandes maravillas que oya, e dixo: "Desde oy mas, mas⁴ me quiero yr de aquí; con todo no quiero, sino quiero esperar, por ver en qual guisa finara Merlin." Y el así estando delante del monumento, vino tan grande tronido e pedrisco, e tan gran ruydo y tan espantoso, y tan gran escuridad, que no veyá ninguna cosa mas que si fuesse de noche oscura, maguer que era vn poco ante de nona. Y oyo en la casa buelta e alboroto tan grande, como si estoviesen ay mil hombres que diessen todos las mayores bozes del mundo. E auia muchas bozes feas y espantosas, de que Bandemagus vuo tan gran miedo, que no se pudo tener en los pies, e parecióle que le fallecía el coraçon, e toda la fuerza del cuerpo le menguaua, e penso luego ser muerto, tan gran miedo vuo. E así estando en tierra, oyo vn baladro grande, como si mil bozes fuesen de so

¹ For correct reading see B.

² The printer probably solved wrongly the abbreviation for *gloria*.

³ Cf. B.

⁴ Cancel; cf. B.

todas las otras, é parecia que lloraba al cielo, é decia aqueella voz: "Ay! cativo, por qué nasci, pues mi fin con tan gran dolor la hé? Di, mezuquino Merlin, ré (*sic*) donde vás á te perder? Ay! qué pérdida tan dolorosa!" Estas palabras é otras muy sentibles dixo. E sobre esto Merlin calló é murió, con un muy doloroso baladro, que fué en tan alta voz que, segun lo escribe el autor é otros muchos que desto fablaron, este baladro que entonces dió Merlin fué oydo sobre todas las otras voces, que sonó á dos jornadas á todas partes. E hoy día están ahí los padrones que los hombres buenos de aquel tiempo fizieron poner, é están ahí porque sea sabido por dó fué la voz oyda é fasta dó llegó el sonido della. E las candelas que él fizo arder siempre de luengo tiempo sobre los tres reys que mató el rey Artur quando venció al hermano del rey Rion fueron luego muertas, é otras muchas cosas acaescieron aquel día que Merlin murió, que las tovieron por maravilla. Por esto lo llaman el Baladro de Merlin en romance, el qual será de grado oydo de muchas gentes, en especial de aquéllos caballeros que nunca fizieron villanía, sino proezas é grandes bondades de caballería, é cosas extrañas que fizieron los caballeros de la Tabla Redonda: desto dá cuenta por extenso la historia del Santo Greal.

vno, las mayores que pudiesen ser, y auia vna boz entre ellas atan grande, que parecia entre las otras que allegaua al cielo, e decia mucho abiertamente: "¡Ay mezuquino! ¿por que nasci, pues mi fin fue de tal manera e con gran dolor?; Ay mezuquino Merlin! ¿do vas tu a perderte?" Y estas palabras e otras muchas que dixo sobre esto acabadas, callo, e allí murio assi.

E sepan todos los que esta historia vieren, assi los ricos como las otras gentes, que aquel baladro que dio Merlin, que fue oydo sobre las otras bozes, que sono tres leguas a todas partes, e oy dia estan y los padrones que hombres buenos ay pusieron en aquel tienpo, y estaran ay por siempre, por que sea sabido por do fue la boz, e fasta do lego el sonido della; ca sin falta esto fue gran marauilla, e las candelas que el fiziera sienpre arder de luengo tienpo que tenian los reyes treze que mato el rey Artur quando vencio ha Nero, hermano del rey Rion, amataronse; otras muchas cosas que acaecieron aquel dia quel murio, que tuuieron los honbres por marauilla grande. E por esto llaman a este libro en romance¹: EL BALADRO DE MERLIN, que sera de grado oydo de todos caualleros e honbres buenos que del oyeron² fablar, ca los buenos caualleros de aquel tienpo nunca fazian villania ni la dirian si lo entendiessen, pero que todos no guardauan esto, mas mucho os contare de grandes noblezas e de grandes bondades de caualleria e ardimiento, e cosas extrañas que fizieron los buenos caualleros de la Tabla Redonda e muchos otros, que hombre no podria contar de quanto ellos fizieron, e esto deuia bien la hystoria del sancto Grial, que es de creer e verdaderamente lo que viere que es de poner en este libro, esto

¹ Sommer, *ZrP* 32 (1908) 333, is wrong in calling this an "Ungenauigkeit." en romance = en castellano.

² oyeren?

porne, e assi como los grandes caualleros e los grandes fechos que los buenos caualleros fizieron, e las grandes proezas de Tristan, e de Lançarote, y de Galaz, y de los otros caualleros de la Tabla Redonda; e los buenos caualleros escucharan de grado este libro, por muchas cosas y fermosas e buenas que oyran del palacio e de cortesía, que los buenos caualleros fizieron en aquel tienpo; e los buenos que se nonbrar quisieren de las proezas y de las cortesias que aqueste libro habla, tirarse han afuera de hazer villania, ni de hazer cosa que le mal este; mas esto digo de los buenos, mas no de los embidiosos e malos, e brauos, e profaçadores e maldizientes, y de mala verdad e mentirosos, y que meten discordia y desamor entre los grandes señores e los sus vassallos; onde los grandes señores se tienen por engañados muchas vezes; e para estos caualleros tales, no fue este libro fecho, ni hizo dellos mincion, ca valdria por ende menos, saluo a lugares que dize de algunos forçadamente, mas los altos y buenos lo verán e loarán lo que conuiene, que guardaran en sus coraçones cortesía e verdad, e mesura, e bien hazer e servir a Dios, y meteran todas estas cosas en obra.

Cap. CCCXXXIX.—*Como Bandemagus se leuanto e salio de la camara muy espantado.*

Baudemagus estuvo así atordado del espanto que hubo en oír el baladro de Merlin, é tanto estuvo atordado como uno pudiera andar una jornada. E desde en su acuerdo tornó, vió tanta multitud de diablos que le pareció que toda la tierra cobrian, é salió de allí con grant espanto é con mucho dolor por que no pudo remediar en cosa la muerte de Merlin, é así como hombre el más

Quenta la hystoria que se esmorecio allí Bandemagus del gran baladro que oyo, que anduiera tres leguas mientras el así estubo. E quando acordo e fue en su seso, abrio los ojos, e vio toda la escuridad yda, e las bozes no sonauan, mas la camara oía muy mal, que no podia peor. E yrguiose, e salio de la camara a gran passo muy espantado, que nunca ouiera miedo que le¹ a esto acostasse.

Cap. CCCXL.—*De como Bandemagus*

¹ se?

de los tristes fué á dó habia dexado su donzella, la qual desde que le vió fué muy atribulada, porque le vió tan desfigurado, que á gran pena le conocia, é preguntóle con infinitos ruegos que le dicesse de qué venia assí desfigurado é dó habia estado tanto tiempo. Baudemagus vistos los congoxosos ruegos que su donzella le fazia se esforzó á fablar, que tal venia que con toda pena podia ser entendido lo que decia, é lo mejor que pudo contó punto por punto á la doncella todo lo que habia visto é oydo.

fallo muerta a su donzella, del grande espanto que ouo.

Luego que Bandemagus salio de la camara, fuesse para do dexara a su donzella. E quando la vio, hallo que estaua muerta, y que muriera por miedo de los baladros; e Bandemagus cuydaua que estaua amortecida, y desde que vio que era muerta, ouo dello muy gran pesar, e dixo: "¡Ay Dios, que mala-ventura es esta! ¿Quien vio nunca tan gran marauilla?" E cato e vio vno de sus caualleros muertos, e dixo: "¡Dios señor, como he gran cuyta e gran pesar desta donzella, que assi se murio por tan mala-ventura!"; y desi partiose de alli, e fuesse para la corte del rey Artur, e contole todo lo acaescido de la muerte de Merlin, y el mandolo poner en scripto.

Cap. CCCXLI.—*De algunas profecias que el sabio Merlin dixo antes de su muerte.*

What follows in *B*, viz., the finding of Morlot by Baudemagus, the sending back of the damsel to her country, the search for Meliadus who is killed by Morlot, the parting of Morlot and Baudemagus, the former going to Ireland, the latter to Arthur's court where the news of Merlin's death fills everyone and especially the king with great grief,—these concluding lines for stylistic reasons I hold to be the work of the redactor of *B*.

In view of the almost literal agreement between chaps. 337-340 of *D*¹ 1535 and chap. 38 of *B*—and this agreement extends in all probability to the parts preceding; cf. the table of contents of *B* (G. Paris and Ulrich, *Merlin* 1, LXXXVIII) and that of *D*¹ 1535 (Bonilla, *Libros de Caballerias* 1, 535)¹—and the fact that *B* is the older text and often furnishes a better reading, it seems probable that *D*¹ 1535 was printed from *B*. That such is not the case I should conclude from a comparison of the following passage of *B*: "los tres reys que mató el rey Artur cuando venció al hermano

¹ The indications of Gallardo as to the number of folios in the *Demanda* 1515 and 1535 (I, 891 nos. 812 and 813) and in the *Baladro* (I, 950 no. 931) would seem to corroborate this opinion. Cf. also Brugger, *Zeitschr. f. franz. Sprache* 34, I, 118.

del rey Rion" with the corresponding one of *D*¹ 1535 (chap. 338): "los reyes treze que mato el rey Artur quando vencio ha Nero, hermano del rey Rion." As against *B*, *D* has the correct reading *treze* (cf. chap. 224)¹ and in addition: *Nero* (cf. chap. 217), neither of which the printer could very well have arrived at by himself. It follows then that *B* and *D*¹ 1535 (the latter presumably through *Merlin*, Sevilla, 1500) go back to a common source.

We shall now see whether the *Merlin* of our *Ms.* and *D* are related and how. I have chosen passages from the beginning, middle, and end of *Merlin* and those corresponding in *D*¹ 1535:

Aqui comiença la estoria de Merlin e cuyo fijo fue. ¶ E del rrey Artus e de como gano la Grand Bretaña que se dize Inglaterra.

Mucho sañudos fueron elos diablos, quando Nuestro Señor fue a los infiernos e saco ende Adan e Eva e de los otros quantos le progo. E tovieronlo por maravilla e enañaronse e dexieron: "Que onbre podría ser que nos forço e que nuestras fortalezas nos quebranto? E nada non nos valle contra el nin guarda que tengamos non se le puede asconder que todo su plazer non faga. Demas que non cuydamos que onbre de mugier nasciese que nuestro non fuese. E este nos destroyo, asy que nascio; que non vimos [en el] nada de saber² de onbre terrenal, asy como vemos e sabemos de los otros onbres." Entonce rrespondio uno dellos: "Una cosa nos mato³ que cuydavamos nos que nos valiese. Las profectas que ante dezieran quel fijo de Dios vernia salvar a los peccadores aquellos quel salvar quiesese. Aquellos faziamos nos atormentar mas que a los otros, asy

Aqui comiença el primero libro de la Demanda del Sancto Grial; e primeramente se dira del nascimiento de Merlin.

En esta presente historia se cuenta como los diablos fueron muy sañudos quando nuestro señor Jezu Christo fue a los infiernos e saco dende a Adan e a Eva, y de los otros quantos le plugo; e tuuieronlo por gran marauilla. Ca dixeron: "¿Que hombre podia ser este que assi nos forço? que nuestras fortalezas no valen ninguna cosa contra el; ni cosa que en guarda tengamos no se le puede defender, ni esconder, que no faga de todo su plazer, e demas que no pensamos que hombre que de mugier naciesse que no fuesse nuestro; y este nos destroyo assi como nascio, que no vimos en el mengua de hombre terrenal, assi como vemos e sabemos de los otros hombres;" y estonce respondio vno dellos, e dixo: "Vna cosa nos mato: que pensamos nos que valiessen mas los profetas que ante dezian que el hijo de Dios vernia en tierra para saluar los pecadores, aquellos que

¹ The erroneous reading of *B* has been pointed out by G. Paris (*Merlin* 1, LXXVIII n. 3).

² Cf. *D* and Sommer, *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances* 2, 3, 9: "nous nauons ueu en li nul delit terrien ensi com nous auons ueu de tous autres hommes."

³ *Ms.* e coxo a nos mato. Cf. *D* and *Vulg. Vers.* 2, 3, 10: "Lors respont vns autres anemis & dist ce nous a mort que nous quidiens que mieux nous deuit valoir."

vivos en tierra como muertos aqui. E fazia[n]nos semejar que non davan nada por nuestros tormentos; ante confortavan a los peccadores, porque les dezian que nasceria en tierra el que los vernia librar. Atanto lo dezieron, fasta que vino e nos tolio lo que avyamos aqui e asy que nos toldra los otros que vivos son, si fuer sesudo. Pero como pudo venir que lo nunca sopimos?" Dixo el otro: "Que nos lo tolio e non lo sabes tu?" Dixo el otro: "Non." "Sepas tu que los faz lavar a los sus servientes en una [agua] sagrada en el su nonbre, e por aquella agua son quitos de todos sus peccados. E quando los lavan a sus servientes, dicen asy: En el nonbre del padre e del fijo e del spiritu sancto. Amen. E por esta rrazon nos los tuelle, e del peccado de Adan e de Eva [por] que los deviamos de aver, los agora perdemos por esto que non avemos sobre ellos ningund poder. E mas nos y fizo; que dexo en la tierra sus servientes que los salvan por confesion. E tantas non faran de nuestras obras que, sy ellos se confesaren ende e se quiesieren quitar e arrenpentir e fizieren lo que les ellos mandaren, nunca seran en nuestro poder. E por esto los avemos todos perdidos. Ca todos seran salvos en esta guysa, si quiesieren creher a los sus sergientes."

¶ En como la madre de Merlin fue presa por mando del juez.

Entonce se torno para su casa e estudo y una grand pieça en paz, fasta que los juezes lo sopieron e mandaronla prender. E quando fue presa, embio por el onbre bueno, e el fue lo mas ayna que pudo e fablo ante ellos. E los juezes mostraron lo que ella dezia e dexieron: "Que cuydades que podiese

saluarse quisiessen; e quando algunos de los que teniamos en nuestro poder lo dezian, atormentauamoslos mas que a los otros; y ellos nos dezian que dauan poco por nuestros tormentos, e confortauan a los otros peccadores, e dezianles que aquel nasceria e los vernia a librar."

Capitulo I.—*De como fablaron los diablos entre si.*

"Tanto lo dixeran assi, fasta que vino a que nos tomo los que teniamos aqui; e assi nos podria tomar los otros que biuos son, si fuesse sesudo. Pero, ¿como pudo auer lo que nunca supimos?" "E como! dixo otro, ¿no sabes tu que les faze lauar en vna agua, e por su nonbre e por aquella agua se lauan de todos los peccados, en el nonbre del padre y del fijo y del spiritu santo, y del pecado de Adan y de Eua por que nos los deuiamos auer? e agora los perderemos por esto, e no auremos ningun poder sobre ellos; e si ellos no quiesieren, que no se saluen por sus obras y se nos metan en poder; assi nos ha quebrantado e abaxado nuestro poder; e mas fizo: dexo en la tierra a sus seruidores que los saluaran; ya tantas no faran de las nuestras obras, si se confessaren, e se quiesieren ende quitar, e fizieren lo que sus maestros mandaren, que todos no los ayamos perdidos. Ca todos seran saluos por esta manera."

Cap. XIV.—*Como los juezes mandaron prender a su madre de Merlin, y ella embio por el hombre bueno.*

Y estonces se torno para su casa, y estuvo vna gran pieça en paz; mas despues que los juezes lo supieron, mandaronla prender; y ella, quando fue presa, embio por el hombre bueno y el fue alla lo mas ayna que pudo, e fallola delante ellos; y ellos lo llamaron, e

esto ser que mugier oviese fijo sin onbre?" E el onbre bueno rrespondio: "Non dire agora quanto se. Mas tomat agora mi consejo e non justiciades, mientras fuer preñada; ca non seria derecho nin rrazon. Ca el moço non merecio muerte nin es en culpa del peccado de la madre. Ca asy podres matar al que non fizo por que." E dixieron los juezes: "Señor, faremos y todo lo que nos mandaredes e tovierdes por bien." E el dixo: "Yo tengo por bien que vos que la guardedes en una torre e que metades con ella dos mugieres que la ayuden a su parto. E quando el moço nasciere, fazerlo hedes criar, fasta que coma por sy e atender fasta entonce. E por aventura vos fara Dios entender sy es verdat lo que ella dize. E si mentiere, faredes della vuestro plazer." E los juezes dixieron que dezia el onbre bueno bien, e fueron y otorgados.

dixeronle: "¿Pensades vos que esto pueda ser, que muger ouiesse fijo sin hombre?" Y el hombre bueno les dixo: "No vos dire que fue; mas tomat mi consejo y no la justicieys preñada, ca la criature no merece muerte ni culpa en el pecado de su madre"; e los juezes dixeron: "Nos faremos quanto quisierdes"; y el dixo: "Yo quiero que la metades en vna torre, y que metades con ella dos mugeres que la ayuden al tiempo de su parto, e, quando el niño naciere, Dios nos fara entender por alguna manera si es assi como ella dize, o si es mentira; y entonces faredes della todo vuestro plazer." Y ellos dixeron que dezia muy bien.

¶ En como Merlin mando a Blaxe que escriviese lo que el dezia.

Asy mostro Merlin esta obra e fizola conosçer a Blaxe. E el se maravillava mucho de las grandes cosas que dezia, e que le semejaván buenas e fermosas. En quanto entendia de fazer estas cosas, e Merlin dixo a Blaxe: "Converna a ty de todas estas cosas que escrivieres sofrir grand afan e grand trabajo, e yo mayor." E Blaxe le rrespondio: "En como?" Merlin le dixo: "Por mi enbiaran de contra Oriente, e aquellos que me vienen buscar, prometen a su señor que levaran de mi sangre e que me mataran. E quando ellos me vieren e oyeren fablar, non averan ende talante. E quando fuer con ellos, tu yras para aquellos que tienen el Sancto Grial e

Cap. XXVI.—*Como Merlin dixo a Blaysen que lo venian a buscar de contra Oriente.*

Esta obra asy deuiso Merlin, e fizola conocer a Blaysen, y el se marauillo de las marauillas que dezia, e parescieronle buenos e hermosos.¹ Y Merlin le dixo: "Conuernate a hazer libro, e a sofrir afan e lazeria, e yo mayor"; e dixo Merlin a Blaysen: "Por mi embiaran de contra Oriente; e aquellos que me vinieren a buscar, juraron a su señor de leuar la mi sangre y que me mataran, e quando ellos me vieren e oyeren, no aueran talante de me matar, e quando yo me fuere con ellos, tu te yras para aquellos que tienen el sancto Grial y escriuiras en este libro quanto me auino e auiniere de aqui adelante; e otrosi todos los fechos de los grandes

¹ I. buenas e hermosas.

escribiras en este libro mi nascencia e quanto¹ me avyno e desaqui aveniere e de todos los otros desta tierra. E este libro sera para sienpre jamas rretraydo e de coraçon oydo en todos los lugares. Enpero non sera en actoridat, porque non es de los apostolos; ca los apostoles non me(n)tieron nunca en escripto de Nuestro Señor Jesu Cristo que non viesen. E asy como soy obscuro contra aquellos que me non quyero² mostrar, asi sera este libro que pocos lo averan. E tu lo levaras, quando yo me fuere con aquellos que me vernan buscar para alla con el libro de Josep. E quando vieres³ el trabajo acabado e que seas tal qual debes seer en su compañía, ende[re]çaras e juntaras el su libro con el tuyo. E asy sera la cosa bien provada de mi trabajo e del suyo.⁴ E (de) los que fueren de la compañía de Dios (e) rrogarle han por vos.⁵ E quando anbos los libros fueren juntados, avra muy fermoso libro. Tanto te digo agora; ca te non puedd desir nin devo las otras palabras que Jesu Cristo dixo. Quedan otras muchas cosas de escrevir del libro de Josep e de Merlin por la gran prolixidat que aqui non se escribe.

hombres desta tierra, y este libro por siempre sera traydo; e oyrlo han de grado en muchos lugares, e tu leuaras este libro quando me yo fuere con aquellos que me fueren a buscar, e ponerlo has con el libro de Joseph; e quando los libros ambos fueren juntados, aura entonce vn hermoso libro muy sabroso de oyr, las ciertas palabras que Jesuchristo dixo a Joseph Abarmatia"; e sabe por verdad que la sancta historia del sancto Grial es llamada assi por tal nombre, porque fue de la su preciosa sangre quando la cogio Joseph en el vaso, y esto lo metio en su monimento que el tenia para si en su huerto, en que nunca otro hombre estuuiera, e que esta historia que Blaysen hizo començola, assi como vos yo digo, a quinientos e quarenta años despues de la passion de Jesuchristo.

Finally I compare a selection from the Lançarote fragment of our Ms. with the corresponding passage in *D*² 1535:

* ¶ En como fallaron a Lançarote con la rreyna.

Tanto que el rrey Artus fue a caça, embio la rreyna desir a Lançarote que veniese a ella, onde al non feziese. E el fue muy ledo e consejose con Boores. "Por Dios, non vayades alla; ca bien

Cap. CCCXCV.—*Como el rey e sus cavalleros fueron ydos a caça.*

E tanto que el rey e sus cavalleros fueron ydos a caça, embio la rreyna por Lançarote, que se fuesse luego para ella, e no fiziesse al por ninguna cosa. Y el fue muy alegre, y dixo que queria

¹ Ms. quando.

² An original *quyero* has been changed by the scribe to *quyeré*.

³ Probably *ovieres*. Cf. *Vulg. Vers.* 2, 20, 5: "& quant tu auras ta paine achieuee. . . ."

⁴ tuyo? Cf. *Vulg. Vers.* 2, 20, 8: "de ma paine & de la tole."

⁵ nos? Cf. *Vulg. Vers.* 2, 20, 9: "proleront nostre seignor por nous."

sabedes que, sy alla ydes, pesar vos ende verna. Ca he pavor de vos, e el mi coraçon me lo diz." E el dixo que lo non dexaria en ninguna guisa. "Pues asy queredes, señor, yd escondidamente e levat con vos vuestra espada." E fuese a la camara de la rreyna. Mas sabet que bien entendio el que Morderec e sus hermanos con muchos cavalleros le tenian la puerta de la camara. En tanto quanto el entro en la camara, echose con la rreyna. Mas non yogo y mucho; que luego venieron a la puerta los que lo esperavan. E fallaronla cerrada e dixieron [a] Agravayn: "Que faremos? Quebrantaremos la puerta?" Dixo el: "Si." Desy ferieron a la puerta. E oyolos la rreyna e levantose toda tollida e dixo a Lançarote: "Ay, amigo, muertos somos." "Como," dixo el, "que es esto?" E escucho e oyo a la puerta grand grita¹ e grandes bozes de onbres do querian quebrantar la puerta, mas non podian. "Ay," dixo ella, "amigo, agora sabra el rrey mi fazienda e la vuestra. Todo esto nos ordio Agravayn." "Sy Dios me ayuda," dixo el, "yo ordire la su muerte." Entonce se levanto del lecho. "Ay, señora," dixo el, "a y aqui alguna loriga?" "Certas," dixo ella, "non; ca plaze a Dios que muramos aqui amos. Pero sy ploguiesse a Dios que vos escapasedes de aqui, se yo bien que non y a tal que me ose matar sabiendo que vos erades bivo. Mas cuydo que nuestros pecados nos confondran." Entonce vino Lançarote a la puerta e dio voces a los que fuera estaban e dixo: "Malos cavalleros e covardes, atendet un poco; ca çedo avredes (e) ela puerta abierta, e yo vere qual sera el ardit que entrara primero." Entonce abrio la puerta e dixo: "Agora entrat." E un cavallero

yr lo mas escondidamente que pudiesse, e despues consejose con Boores como haria. "¡Ay señor, dixo el, por Dios no querays yr alla, que sabed que si alla ydes, por vuestro pesar sera, ca mi coraçon me lo dize!" Y el dixo que no lo dexaria por ninguna guisa. "Señor, dixo el, pues no os queredes hincar, e a coraçon lo auedes de yr, yo os mostrare como vayades escondidamente; veys aqui vna huerta, que yredes por ella hasta en su camara de la reyna, que no vos vea hombre nacido; mas todavia leuad con vos vuestra espada, ca no sabe hombre lo que le auiene." Y el hizolo assi, y fuesse para la camara de la reyna; mas sabed que bien entendio que Morderec e sus hermanos le tenian la puerta con piega de caualleros. E tanto que entro en la camara, cerro la puerta, e despues echose con la reyna en vna, muy rica cama. Y ellos assi yaziendo, començaron a dar grandes golpes a la puerta e quisieron entrar, e hallaronla bien cerrada, e dixerón: "Que haremos?" E Agravayn dixo: "Quebrantemosla"; e assi començaron a ferir por la quebrantar; e oyolo la reyna, e leuantose toda tollida, e dixo: "¡Ay amigo Lançarote, como somos muertos!" "Como? dixo el, ¿e que es esto?" Y escucho, e oyo a la puerta gran rebuelta de caualleros, e querian quebrantar la puerta e no podian. "Ay amigo, dixo ella, agora sabra el rey de mi fazienda e la vuestra, e todo esto nos ha boluido Agravayn." "Si Dios me ayuda, dixo el, yo ordire su muerte." Y estonce se yrguio de la la cama, e dixo: "¡Ay señora! ¿aqui no ay ninguna loriga?" "No, dixo ella, ca semejame que plaze a Dios que muramos aqui ambos; empero, si pluguiesse a Dios que escapasedes vos sano, no ay aqui tal que me osasse

¹ Ms. grite.

que avya nonbre Canagoys que desamava mucho a Lançarote entro primero. E Lançarote que tenia ya la espada sacada feriole de toda su fuerça en guysa quel non presto arma que lo non fendiese fasta en las espaldas e dio con el muerto en tierra. E quando los otros vieron este golpe, non ovo y tal que osase entrar, ante se fezieron afuera en tal guysa que la entrada fingo libre. E quando esto vyo Lançarote, dixo a la rreyna: "Señora, esta guerra es fayda¹. Quando a vos ploguiere, yrme." E ella dixo: "Si vos fuerdes en salvo, yo non avre pavor de mi."

matar sabiendo que vos eras¹ biuo; mas cuydo que nuestros pecados nos alcançan agora." Y estonce tomo su espada, e abraço el manto, e fuesse para la puerta, e abriola, e començo a dar bozes a los que estauan fuera, diziendo: "Caualleros malos e couardes, atended, que yo os abriere la puerta, e uere qual sera el mas ardido que entrara primero." E despues parose en medio de la puerta, su espada en la mano. E vn cauallero que auia nombre Cinagis, que desamaua a Lançarote, dexose correr por la puerta. E Lançarote yrguio la espada, e firiole de tan gran fuerça, que no le presto yelmo que truxiesse. E fendiolo fasta en las espaldas, e dio con el muerto en tierra. E quando los otros vieron este golpe; no vuo ay tan ardido que osasse entrar dentro, ante se hizieron afuera, en tal guisa que la entrada hingo libre. Quando el esto vio, dixo a la reyna: "Señora, esta guerra es acabada; e quando os plaze, yrme he." Y ella dixo: "Si vos fuerdes en saluo, yo no aure pavor de mi."

As for the conclusions that can be drawn from the last comparisons, it is obvious that *D* 1535 was not copied from *G*. But it is likewise obvious that *D* 1535 (resp. *Merlin*, Sevilla, 1500) and *G* (i.e. so far the *Estoria de Merlin* and *Lançarote*) are from a common source. This source (*O*) is then the same for *B*³, *Merlin*, Sevilla, 1500, and *G*.

I now turn to the discussion of the relation of *G* to *O*.

At the outset it may be stated (as the reader would probably have supposed) that *G* and *O* are *originally* a French work. This is

¹ *erds* presupposes *erdes*, a form known only to me from Galician.

² Either the (Portuguese) original read *saida* and the translator mistook long *s* for *f*, leaving it to the reader to understand the word as he might, or a scribe made a mistake in copying *fenida*.

³ It is true that the redactor of *B* (*Merlin* 1, LXXXVIII) says, concerning his work: "yo no de mio este libro coplé, mas transferile de una lengua en otra." (Similarly in the "Prologo" [p. LXXXIII].) But it will be sufficient to quote Gayangos, *Libros de Caballerias* XLVI: "[es] sabida la invariable costumbre de los escritores de este género de libros, quienes, sin excepcion alguna, que sepamos, pretendieron siempre haber hallado sus originales en lengua caldea, griega, húngara ó inglesa" (add: árábica—Lepolemo I; Don Quixote).

demonstrated beyond a doubt by a comparison, however cursory, of the *Libro de Josep Abarimatia* with e.g. *Lestoire del saint Graal* (Vulg. Vers. 1), of the *Estoria de Merlin* with *Lestoire de Merlin* (Vulg. Vers. 2), of *Lançarote* with *Mort Artu* (ed. Bruce, 1910) 99.

G is nothing but a fragment of *O*. The *Estoria de Merlin* counts 26 chapters as against 341 chapters of *D*¹ 1535; the *Lançarote* 3 chapters as against 455 chapters of *D*² 1535. The same conclusion can be reached without any reference to *D*, by an examination of the *Estoria* alone.

The heading of the *Estoria* reads: "Aqui comiença la estoria de Merlin e cuyo fijo fue. ¶ E del rrey Artus e de como gano la Grand Bretaña que se dize Inglaterra." Evidently the scribe intended to copy Arthur's history at least until his coronation (= *D*¹ chap. 136). He did not, however, carry out his plan, "dexandose en el tintero, ya por descuydo, por malicia, o ygnorancia, lo mas sustancial de la obra." He merely touches upon Arthur's history in the very last lines of the *Estoria* and in connection with incidents later than the coronation (cf. below). On the other hand *D* gives a story of Arthur's life from his birth (= *D*¹ chap. 123) until his disappearance with "Morgayna la encantadora" (= *D*² chap. 434).

Moreover, just before the final chapter of the *Estoria* (quoted above = *D*¹ chap. 26) follow a few more instructions of Merlin to Blaxe (which are lacking in *D*). They are: "E eso mismo escreviase de los rreys de la Grand Bretaña, de Costança e de Vertiger, su hermano,¹ e de los tres fijos de Costance, Manes, Pandragon, Uter. E de como lidiaron los sansoneses con el rrey Manes de Bretaña, e fue vencido. E de como sus vasallos lo mataron, porque non era bueno. E acordaron que fuese Vertiger rrey. E de como este mato a los que mataron al rrey Manes. E de como se levantaron los rricos onbres contra Vertiger. E de como este Vertiger mando fazer la torre. E de los consejos de los clerigos para hedificar la torre por arte de las estrellas. E de como se aconsejaron los maestros de la torre. En como los maestros fezieron entender al rrey la mentira. En como el rrey embio buscar a Merlin. E de como lo supo e lo dixo a Blaxe.² E de como Merlin con los mandaderos del rrey se despedio

¹ vassallo, *D*¹ 1535 chap. 27.

² From now on it is no longer Merlin, but the scribe who speaks.

de su madre e se fue con ellos e levo consigo a Blaxe. E de como llevo a la tierra de Vertiger el rrey, e saliole a rrescebir. E de como levo el rrey a Merlin a ver la torre. E de como fizo el rrey todo lo que le mando Merlin acerca de lo de la torre, e sacaron los dragones debaxo del agua. E como se fizo luego la torre. [E] morio el rrey Vertiger. E ayuntaronse los rricos onbres para alçar rrey que mantoviese el rreyno. E en como les diera Merlin consejo que ayunasen e orasen en el dia del natal e que Nuestro Señor les daria rrey." Of all this there is nothing in the *Estoria* (while a detailed narration¹ is found in *D*¹ chaps. 27-54). The scribe then goes back in the tale (cf. above the final chapter of the *Estoria* [= *D*¹ chap. 26]). The concluding lines of the *Estoria* are these: "Quedan otras muchas cosas de escrevir del libro de Josep e de Merlin por la grand prolixidat que aqui non se escreve. E de como soño un sueño el Artus rrey e esso mismo Merlin. De una bestia que se llamava ladrador,² de como venia a beber a la fuente. E de como se fallara ende el rrey Artus sin cavallo e le veniera un su escudero. E de como veniera ende Merlin e le desposiera el sueño [e] que fuera³ de aquella bestia, e se maravillava el rrey del su dezir. De como dexiera al rrey cuyo fijo fuera. E en esto estava Merlin en semejança de moço. E de como le dezia el rrey (o) que era el diablo. E se fue e torno ende como viejo Adan." (The particulars here referred to are told in *D*¹ chaps. 144-150. But the scribe of the *Estoria* has much altered the order.)

The *Estoria de Merlin* of *G* is preceded by the *Libro de Josep Abarimatia*. It stands to reason that the scribe of *G* copied this also from *O*. Bearing in mind the way the scribe dealt with *O* in the case of the *Estoria*, we should expect something similar, i.e., a fragmentary handling also in the case of the *Libro*. And so it is.

The *Libro* follows more or less *Lestoire del saint Graal* (*Vulg. Vers.* 1) from p. 12, 30 to p. 46, 17 (Josafas [Josephes] has conjured the devil to tell what he knows about the impending battle between Evolat [Eualac] and Tolomer [Tholomers]. The devil answers that he does not know anything about the things that are to come).

¹ Except the last heading.

² Ms. ladrador.

³ viera?

Here the scribe of *G* limits himself to an enumeration of the following headings: "¶ t°. En como llevo un mandadero al rrey Evolat como el rrey Tolomer venia sobrel. ¶ t°. De como Evolat fizo juntar su poder. ¶ t°. En como prometio el rrey a Josafas que se tornaria cristiano. ¶ t°. De como Josafas dio el escudo colot¹ al rrey Evolat para yr sobre el rrey Tolomer. ¶ t°. En como el rrey Evolat dio en la vueste del rrey Tolomer. ¶ t°. En como se combatieron el rrey Evolat e el rrey Tolomer e sus gentes. ¶ En como Evolat vencio a Tolomer e le mato grant gente." All this matter is set forth in *Lestoire*, pp. 46, 18—about 65, 30. Then instead of telling us like *Lestoire* the story of Sarrachinte, the wife of Eualac, the scribe of *G*, as in the case of the *Estoria de Merlin*, goes back in his tale and narrates how Merlin gave to Evolat an account of his former life (= *Lestoire* 47, 4). Thereupon Evolat promises to become a Christian. A few lines stating that a (not before mentioned) "senescal" is met, that Tolomer is made a prisoner, and that Evolat renders thanks to God for having helped him to conquer his enemies, bring the *Libro* to its end.

To sum up, there existed in Spanish a trilogy made up of

- I. *El Libro de Josep Abarimatia*.
- II. *La Estoria de Merlin*.
- III. *La Demanda del Sancto Grial*

II has been preserved twice, in *B* and *D*¹ 1535; III likewise twice, in *D*² 1515 and *D*² 1535; fragments of I-III, in *G*.

Finally, *O* was in all probability the work of one and not of several translators. This probability becomes a certainty when we note that we find scattered in *G*, *B* (presumably in a larger number than the very scant extracts from this edition at present at my disposal show), and in *D* certain Portuguese words and particularities of Portuguese syntax. "Por el hilo se sacará el ovillo." *O* was then the work of one translator. But how are the Portuguese words etc. in *O* to be explained? Do they imply that *O* was itself translated out of Portuguese? That the translator, perhaps a Spaniard of the borderland, a Leonese, allowed, consciously or unconsciously, those words to stand in his version? Or is *O* a translation out of

¹ A later addition.

French, again by a Leonese, who, though endeavoring to write Castilian, could not avoid inserting here and there a Portuguese word? The discussion of these and some other questions connected with *O* and purposely omitted here, I reserve for a later occasion.

K. PIETSCH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE ALLEGORY OF THE *VITA NUOVA*

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate a continuous allegory in the *Vita Nuova*, conveying a message substantially identical with that of the *Divina Commedia*.

Three grounds of antecedent improbability have been urged against allegorical interpretation of Dante's first work: (1) the verisimilitude of the literal story; (2) the facts that the included occasional poems were written at different times, and that they indicate by themselves no allegorization; (3) Dante's own distinction in the *Convito* between the "fervid and impassioned" *Vita Nuova* and the "temperate and virile" *Convito*.

1. Assuming the reality of Beatrice and of Dante's love story, I may contend that, having later realized the moral effect of his experience, he "moralized" the record of his experience. Such a process is not uncommon; and besides it is a fundamental scholastic maxim that the end of a causal sequence is implicit in the beginning.¹

2. I contend that out of a considerable body of occasional poems Dante may have selected those which a connecting and explanatory prose by inreading of meanings not at first intended, by taking advantage of ambiguous words, by tacit interpolation in recapitulation, and by new facts or circumstances related—might adjust to an *ex post facto* allegory. And the fact that he so enriched the original poems is evident.²

3. Dante does not in fact say that the *Vita Nuova* is more "fervid and impassioned" than the *Convito*, but that its manner of treatment is.³ He does say: "And if in the present work . . . the

¹ "Finis est principium omnium operabilium."—Aquinas, *Comm. II Cor.*, XII, iii; cf. Dante, *Epist.* x, 472-74 [Oxford ed.].

² Sonnets I and XXII are in themselves allegorical. Into Sonnets II, III, IV, XVII, and Ode IV the prose reads a mysterious second intention, and into the recapitulation of Sonnet I a highly significant addition. Ode I and Sonnet XI correspond closely to Ode II, and Sonnets XIX-XXII to Ode I, in the *Convito*, where both odes are interpreted allegorically. To Sonnets V and XIV the prose adds a significance originally wanting, namely, the "screening" of his true love, and of the analogy of Beatrice to Christ. The rest are fitted without change—though often by advantage taken of ambiguous words.

³ *Contr.*, I, i, 111 f.

handling¹ be more virile than in the *New Life*, I do not intend thereby to throw a slight in any respect upon the latter, but rather to strengthen that by this." I contend that if the *Convito* is to "strengthen" (*giovare*) the *Vita Nuova*, it can do so only through its allegorical method and message. If so, the alleged objection turns out a confirmation.

But the test of allegory is in its fitting. Assuming allegory in the *Vita Nuova*, I may proceed to try to decipher it.

Dante will give, he says, the *sentenza*,² that is, literally, the gist of the story of his gradually purified desire of Beatrice, allegorically, its significance in terms of that which her name intends, to wit, *beatitudine* or "blessedness." The words—"the glorious lady of my mind³ who was called *Beatrice* by many that knew not what they were calling her"—are, like other significant words in the work, designedly ambiguous. *Mente* means both "memory" and "mind." Blessedness is the object of his mind.⁴ She is properly "glorious," since perfect blessedness is attainable only in the life of glory hereafter,⁵ being the vision of God as he is, "face to face."⁶ For in this life we see God, as St. Paul says, only "by a mirror in enigma."⁷

Now St. Paul's declaration implies, according to Aquinas, three ways of seeing a sensible object: (1) by actual presence of the object in the eye, such as light; (2) by presence therein of the image of the object, as of a man; (3) by presence therein of an image of the image of the object, as of a man in a mirror. God alone sees himself fully the first way. The angels, pure intelligences, see him the second way. We see him only the third way, that is, by reflection of his image, itself invisible to us, in his creatures. In miraculous rapture, however, some, like St. Paul, have momentarily been

¹ *Si trattasse*. I quote Wicksteed's translation. Jackson translates: "the subject is treated"—which makes my point only the sharper.

² *V. N.*, I; cf. *Conv.*, I, II, 123-30.

³ *Mente*.

⁴ ". . . in actu intellectus attenditur beatitudo."—Aquinas, *Summa theol.*, I, qu. xxvi, a. 2.

⁵ ". . . In statu praesentis vitae perfecta beatitudo ab homine haberi non potest. . . . Sed promittitur nobis a Deo beatitudo perfecta, quando erimus sicut angeli in coelo."—Aquinas, I-II, qu. III, a. 2.

⁶ Cf. Dante, *Epist.* x, 612-18.

⁷ "Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate: tunc autem facie ad faciem."—*I Cor.*, xiii, 12.

given,¹ and the elect are promised for eternity, vision of the divine essence like, though not equal to, God's own vision.

The third—or "allegorical"—vision is again of two degrees: (1) where the image in the mirror is clear and open; (2) where it is hidden in enigma. "Thus so as we see the invisible things of God [*invisibilia Dei*] in his creatures, we speak of seeing in a mirror; but so far as those invisible things are hidden from us, we see in enigma." The less spiritual the creature, the more enigmatic is the image it reflects of the divine spirit; and vice versa. And so again, the perceiving soul reflects according to its spirituality enigmatically or clearly and openly the divine image, already more or less distorted in transmission by the creature.²

Human reason, reaching only thus indirectly and gropingly toward its divine object, is purified toward perfect vision by faith, hope, and charity. And "charity," qualifies Aquinas, "is not any love of God whatever, but that love of God by which he is loved as the object of blessedness, to which we are directed by faith and hope."³ From natural friendship with God, common to all his creatures, we rise to the love of him which is charity, privilege of the intellectual creature alone.⁴ Seeing, therefore, the invisible things of God reflected in Beatrice "as in a mirror in enigma," Dante rises from natural desire of the *salute*, her human and "accidental reward," to the charity whose object is the *salute* or "essential reward" of blessedness, to wit, the immediate vision of God. And her injunction in paradise applies to herself as a mirror throughout:

¹ Aquinas, II-II, qu. cixv, a. 3.

² For this theory of the three grades of vision see Aquinas, *Comm. I Cor.*, XIII, iv. I would express my obligation for the reference to Padre Giovanni Busnelli who in his brilliant work—*Il concetto e l'ordine del 'Paradiso' dantesco*, Città di Castello, 1911-12, Parte I, cap. vii—argues application of Aquinas' theory to the *Paradiso*.

³ "... caritas non est qualiscumque amor Dei, sed amor Dei quo diligitur ut beatitudinis objectum, ad quod ordinamur per fidem et spem."—I-II, qu. lxxv, a. 5; cf. Dante, *Epist.* x, 452: "Amor sanctus, sive caritas."

⁴ "Nos autem habemus duplicem conjunctionem cum Deo. Una est quantum ad bona naturae, quae hic participamus ab ipso; alia quantum ad beatitudinem, in quantum nos hic sumus participes per gratiam supernae felicitatis, secundum quod hic est possibile; speramus etiam ad perfectam consecutionem illius aeternae beatitudinis pervenire et fieri cives coelestis Hierusalem. Et secundum primam communicationem ad Deum, est amicitia naturalis, secundum quam unumquodque, secundum quod est, Deum ut causam primam et summum bonum appetit, et desiderat ut finem suum. Secundum vero communicationem secundam est amor caritatis, qua solum creatura intellectualis Deum diligit."—*Comm. I Cor.*, XIII, iv; cf. *Cons.*, III, ii-iii.

Ficca di retro agli occhi tuoi la mente,
e fa di quelli specchi alla figura
che in questo specchio ti sarà parvente.¹

If charity, "because it unites with God, is root of all virtues," pride, because it "separates from God," is "root of all vices and worst of all."² And pride, properly so-called, is "inordinate desire of excellence"—*inordinate*, that is, not *ordered* toward God.³

The protagonists of the allegorical drama of the *Vita Nuova* are then *Charity*, infused by grace of God reflected in Beatrice, and *Pride*, arising from the corruption of human nature after Adam.⁴ Twice, as St. Paul against Christ, Dante through pride sinned against Beatrice, fulfilling inordinate "desires of the flesh and of the mind."⁵ He turns away from her, his blessedness, to follow in the one case the pleasing ladies, "screens of the truth," *piaceri* or pleasures, *simulacra* of blessedness; and in the other case, the consoling lady, or consolation of human reason not ordered to God. In each case the penalty of pride is discord in himself, a "battle of thoughts,"⁶ until, by consideration of his own unworthiness, and of the divine Beatrice, his blessedness, as superior to all other desirable things,⁷ he is humbled to obedience, and, like St. Paul, again receives grace in a vision of his Lord.⁸

Dante's sin of pride, his turning away from God in Beatrice, springs from defect of his vision of faith. Misreading the enigmas

¹ *Par.*, xxi, 16-18; cf. *Epist.* x, 374-79, 400-404.

² Caritas enim dicitur radix omnium virtutum, quia conjungit Deo, qui est ultimus finis; unde sicut finis est principium omnium operabilium, ita caritas est principium omnium virtutum . . . Et ideo superbia proprie dicta separat a Deo, et est radix omnium vitiorum et pessimum omnium.—Aquinas, *Comm. II Cor.*, XII, iii; cf. II-II, q. cxii, a. 7.

³ ". . . est proprie superbia . . . quando quis appetit excellentiam non ordinando illam ad Deum."—Aquinas, *Comm. II Cor.*, XII, iii.

⁴ Duo sunt principia humani generis. Unum, secundum vitam naturae, scilicet Adam; aliud, secundum vitam gratiae, scilicet Christus. . . Adam induxit unum statum, scilicet culpae; Christus vero gloriae et vitae.—Aquinas, *Comm. I Cor.*, XV, vii.

⁵ *Ephes.*, ii, 3.

⁶ "Est autem propria superbiorum poena discordia."—Aquinas, *Comm. Job.*, XI, i.

⁷ "Remedium superbiae est . . . ex consideratione propriae infirmitatis . . . etiam ex consideratione magnitudinis divinae . . . etiam ex imperfectione honorum de quibus homo superbit."—Aquinas, II-II, q. cxii, a. 6.

⁸ "Sic humillatus [recognovit Paulus] se suis viribus stare non posse."—Aquinas, *Comm. II Cor.*, XII, iii. And St. Paul: "Propter quod ter Dominum rogavi . . . Et dixit mihi: Sufficit tibi gratia mea."—*II Cor.*, xii, 7-9; cf. C. H. Grandgent's valuable article "Dante and St. Paul" in *Romania*, XXXI, 14-27.

of his allegorical visions, he pursues false images or *simulacra* of good.¹ At his first turning away, his vision of God in the human Beatrice is overlaid by enigma on enigma. Her human nature, transmitting mirror of God, and his soul, receiving mirror of that image transmitted, are both clouded by their common mortality,² though in unlike degree. For, whereas his nature partakes of the "old Adam" of iniquity, hers partakes solely of the "new Adam" or Christ: as a "Nine" factored by three, the Trinity, alone, she is free from the taint of original sin, and is—like the blessed Virgin—an immaculate conception. At his second turning away, whereas she, her veil of mortality rent, now reflects clearly and openly the divine image, he, though proficient in charity of will, yet through defect of mind, speculative understanding, can reflect but darkly and enigmatically her glory.

That they have grace, says Aquinas,³ "God reveals to some by special privilege, so that for them the joy of security [*securitatis*] may begin even in this life, and so that they may more confidently and strongly undertake great works, and endure the evils of the present life, as it was declared unto Paul (II Cor., xii, 9): *Sufficit tibi gratia mea.*" In this privilege Dante again associates himself with the Apostle. So Beatrice:

Nè impetrare ispirazion mi valse
con le quali ed in sogno ed altrimenti
lo rivocai.⁴

As little did St. Paul's "abundance of revelations" avail to save him from the "prick of the flesh"—concupiscence, as Aquinas interprets.⁵ But these "inspirations," reflected in Dante's imagination as sensible images,⁶ are *ipso facto* allegorical and enigmatic. Only so much enlightenment is vouchsafed as is immediately expedient. "Ask not," warns the apparition of Love, "more than is expedient [*utile*] for thee."⁷ The disciple is not yet competent for the spiritual gift

¹ Cf. *Purg.*, xxx, 130-33.

² Cf. *Par.*, xxxiii, 31-32.

³ *Purg.*, xxx, 133-35; cf. *infra*, p. 9, note 6.

⁴ *Comm. II Cor.*, XII, iii.

⁵ "Visio somnii, non est in parte intellectiva, sed in parte sensitiva."—Aquinas, *Verit.*, qu. xviii, a. 6.

⁷ xii, 40-41.

³ I-II, qu. cxli, a. 5.

of perfect understanding: "to each," says St. Paul, "is given the manifestation of the Spirit expediently [*ad utilitatem*]."¹ Only in the light of perfect vision may the enigmas of imperfect vision be resolved. As the end toward which the successive visions of the *Vita Nuova* lead Dante is Beatrice or blessedness fulfilled in the vision of God, direction to that ultimate vision *in patria* must be implicit in each allegorical vision *in via*. "For from the end," says Aquinas, "must be learned the reasons of those things which are ordered to the end."² Moreover, since Dante's ultimate vision of God was by a sensible image, we might expect this divine image to be enigmatically reflected in his allegorical visions. In fact it is.³

God appeared to Dante as at first "simple light"⁴ filling and dazzling even his miraculously strengthened vision as from a brighter sun.⁵ In itself, Dante's immediate vision of God must be conceived as purely intellectual and of the invisible divine essence; but to communicate it he must resort to sense-images. The simple light, filling his eyes as in Aquinas' first kind of vision, next, as he says, impresses an image, to wit, "three circles of three colors and one magnitude," two as "iris by iris reflected," the third as a flame from the other two.⁶ The three colors are white, green, and red—actually the basic colors of the rainbow, according to Aquinas.⁷ This tri-colored triune circle represents God as seen according to Aquinas' second kind of vision, namely, where the object is possessed by sight not in itself but in the image of itself. The circle is not an arbitrary, but a natural, symbol of God, once he is conceived as a supernal sun. For Dante, I conceive, derived his symbolic images by analogy from gazing fixedly at the actual sun. While we so look,

¹ *I Cor.*, xii, 7.

² "Ex fine enim oportet accipere rationes eorum quae ordinantur in finem."—*I-II*, qu. i, introd.

³ It may be objected that Dante had not yet the symbolic imagery of the *Paradiso* in mind. For my part, I do not clearly see how anyone can know. In any case, it is for the doubters to explain the coincidence.

⁴ *Semplice lume*. On the theological association of God with light, cf. G. Busnelli *op. cit.*, I, 206-7. Light is the "proper object" of the highest sense, sight; cf. *Cens.*, III, ix, 51 f.

⁵ *Par.*, xxxiii, 90, 109-11, 140-41; cf. Busnelli, *op. cit.*, I, 111-12.

⁶ *Par.*, xxxiii, 115-20.

⁷ Cf. Busnelli, *op. cit.*, I, 258-59.

we see only *simple light*. *Lichtchaos* is Helmholtz' word. We cannot miraculously strengthen our sight as Dante feigns, but we can turn our eyes away; and thereupon *after-images* will follow—circles of dissolving iridescent colors, among which white, green, and red are, according to Helmholtz, actually conspicuous.¹ Assuredly, if these are visible at all in the experiment, Dante must have felt their traditional theological symbolism "scientifically" confirmed. Furthermore, on the theological premiss that *faith* is the light of the Father, *hope* the ray of the Son, *charity* the splendor of the Holy Spirit,² it would also be deducible from his experiment that faith is *naturally* symbolized by white, hope by green, charity by red.

The relevance of these symbols to the *Vita Nuova*—of God as a circle, of faith, hope, and charity as white, green, and red—will presently appear. In the first place, they may be further enriched by their application in the *Paradiso* itself, and in the later cantos of the *Purgatorio* describing the earthly paradise.

The image of God as a circular splendor³ of which the center is the "lucent substance"—made visible for Dante in the human figure of Christ in the second circle of the triune iris⁴—is clearly and openly reflected by the "blessed mirrors,"⁵ the angels and the elect, in the degree of their blessedness. In the two lowest planets the elect appear as human forms, centers of radiance; in the higher planets as circular "splendors," completely imaging as "burning suns" the supreme sun. And since, for the blest, faith and hope are canceled in fulfilment, they as "rubies" reflect only the color of charity, or as "flamed circles" the circle of the Holy Spirit, source of charity.⁶

¹ H. von Helmholtz, *Handbuch d. Physiol. Optik*, 3e. Aufl., 1911, II, 211-12.

² Cf. Busnelli, *op. cit.* I, 260; cf., *Conv.*, III, xiv, 41 f.

³ Cf. Henry Vaughan:

I saw Eternity the other night
Like a great ring of pure and endless light.
—*The World*.

⁴ *Par.*, xxxiii, 127-32.

⁵ *Par.*, ix, 61; xviii, 2. The image is enigmatically reflected everywhere in the universe, down to Satan with his vermillion, yellow, and black faces [*Inf.*, xxxiv, 37-45], lightless center of the nine infernal rings, as opposed to the triune God, lucent center of the nine celestial rings [*Par.*, xxviii, 4-35].

⁶ *Par.*, ix, 69; xix, 4; xxx, 66; xxv, 120. I propose, however, this interpretation of the "rubies" with reservations, for I am at present unable to harmonize the description of the contemplative spirits in Saturn as "pearls," and of the Virgin as a "sapphire."

Again, in Beatrice's eyes Dante sees God reflected as an effulgent point, center of the encircling hierarchies; and he turns as one who from a mirror

. . . se rivolge per veder se il vetro
gli dice il vero, e vede ch'el s'accorda
con esso, come nota con suo metro.¹

So in these emparadised eyes, whence first came the grace of charity, is allegorically fulfilled the hope of glory in this vision of God's clear and open image. *In via* on earth grace was not yet fulfilled in glory. Grace was from her eyes, glory in the smile of her lips.² Now *in patria* of paradise her eyes themselves smile.³ In them, immediately reflecting God, "the Alpha and the Omega . . . the beginning and the end" of charity are made one.

Thus in Beatrice's smiling eyes Dante attains "allegorical vision" of God, the second blessedness, or "blessedness of eternal life, which consists in the fruition of the divine aspect . . . and is given to be understood by the celestial paradise."⁴ To this eternal blessedness man attains not by his proper power, but "by spiritual teachings which transcend human reason," followed "by acting according to the theological virtues." By his proper power, that is, "by acting in accordance with the moral and intellectual virtues," he attains the first "blessedness, to wit, of this life . . . figured by the terrestrial paradise."⁵

In that terrestrial paradise, accordingly, led by Beatrice's four purple-clad "handmaids," Dante sees reflected in the "emeralds," her eyes, the two-natured Griffon.⁶ That is to say, by operation of the cardinal virtues, empurpled⁷ from their "root and principle" of charity, he sees in the greenness of hope, Christ human and divine, "Alpha and Omega" of salvation. Then by intercession of the three other ladies "who look more deeply," formed as of flame, of emerald, of snow,⁸ he sees unveiled the "second beauty" of her smile, "the

¹ *Par.*, xxviii, 4-25.

² *V. N.*, xix, 70-75, 131-40; *xxi, passim*; cf. *Conv.*, III, xv, 12-20; *Purg.*, xxxi, 100-145.

³ Cf., e.g., *Par.*, xv, 34-36.

⁴ *De Mon.*, III, xvi, 43 f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 43-52.

⁶ *Purg.*, xxxi, 112-33.

⁷ The classical purple, or blood-red; cf. Virgil *Aen.* ix. 349 (in text as known to Dante).

⁸ *Purg.*, xxix, 121-26.

splendor of the living light eternal."¹ That is to say, by operation of the theological virtues, colored directly from the divine iris, his will is moved Godward by the joy of the promised intellectual vision of him.² But as this "essential reward" is not yet consummated, anticipatory joy of it is indicated by Beatrice's smiling mouth as separated from her eyes, founts of active charity. Only in paradise shall her eyes smile: shall active charity merge in contemplative.³

We may now test the letter of the *Vita Nuova* by the symbols we have briefly considered in the *Paradiso* and the *Purgatorio*, of course attending also to whatever hints are thrown out in the *Vita Nuova* itself.

Sub specie aeternitatis, the end of grace is in the beginning of grace, perfect charity in incipient charity, the life of glory or new life in heaven in the life of grace or new life on earth.⁴ So a retrospective insight shows in Dante's first sight of Beatrice allegorical promise of the vision of blessedness. From the blessedness appearing to his physical vision⁵ will develop the blessedness first of his moral, then of his intellectual vision. For from his heart comes the cry: *Ecce deus fortior me, qui veniens dominabitur mihi*; and love is that god—holy love or charity indicated in the "noblest color, meek and pure, blood-red" in which she is clothed. Charity, "root of all virtues," will grow to fill his heart, crowding out the natural vices, and so possess him with earthly blessedness, grace (*salute*) of the human Beatrice.⁶ Charity, "love of God," will direct his purified desire to

¹ *Purg.*, xxxi, 111, 130-45.

² Cf. Aquinas (*Comm. I Cor.*, XIII, iv): "... haec tria [fides, spes, caritas] conjungunt Deo; alia [dona] non conjungunt Deo nisi mediantibus istis. Alia etiam dona sunt quaedam disponentia ad gignendum ista tria in cordibus hominum; unde et solum ista tria, scilicet fides, spes et caritas, dicuntur virtutes theologicae, quia habent immediate Deum pro objecto."

³ "Essentia beatitudinis in actu intellectus consistit. Sed ad voluntatem pertinet delectatio beatitudinem consequens."—Aquinas, I-II, qu. iii, a. 5; cf. *Conv.*, III, xiv-xv.

⁴ "Finis est principium omnium operabilium."—Aquinas, *Comm. II Cor.*, XII, iii; cf. *Conv.*, III, ii, 60-67; *Par.*, v, 1-12; *Epist.* x, 472-74. Of course, the principle is the major premiss of scholastic theology as a system; cf. G. Santayana, *Three Philosophical Poets*, Cambridge, 1910, pp. 73 ff.

⁵ "... lo spirito animale . . . parlando spezialmente agli spirti del viso, disse queste parole: Apparuit iam beatitudo vestra."—II, 26-32.

⁶ Incidentally, it is a fact that Holy Communion is usually first received at about nine years of age; and Charity is one of the effects of the sacrament of the Eucharist. Again, from Charity comes the Gift of Wisdom, as that of Understanding from Faith, and that of Knowledge from Hope; and among the effects of Wisdom are illuminations, visions, and consolations. I am indebted for this note to Sister Marie Elise Guérin.

intellectual contemplation of God, and so possess him hereafter with heavenly blessedness, the *salute* of the divine Beatrice. Thus for him in her human and divine natures, on earth and in heaven, she is what Christ is for mankind—"Alpha and Omega . . . beginning and end" of salvation.¹ Implicit from the outset is this analogy between Beatrice and Christ made explicit in chap. xxiv. So the *deus qui dominabitur* is implicitly very God; and Beatrice is with deeper intent than compliment described as the "daughter of God,"² since in glory, wisdom-crowned, she will reflect the image of that Wisdom who is "not only spouse, but sister and beloved daughter . . . of the Emperor of heaven."³

This interpretation, it will be noted, precisely concords with Dante's illustration of allegorical interpretation in the Epistle to Can Grande. "If [we inspect] the allegory, our redemption wrought by Christ [is presented]; if the moral sense, the conversion of the soul from the grief and misery of sin to the state of grace . . . if the anagogical, the departure of the holy soul from the slavery of this corruption to the liberty of eternal glory."⁴ In this apparently casual interpretation of a scriptural text for illustration merely, Dante not only explains his allegorical method, but declares the gist of his one allegorical message.

Dante has received incipient charity, by which, says Aquinas, "man withdraws from sin and overcomes concupiscence."⁵ For nine years love ruled him under "the faithful counsel of reason."⁶ Then by Beatrice, clothed in white, is given the salutation (*salute*), the grace "in the hope of which," he says, "no enemy was left to me, but rather a flame of charity possessed me which made me pardon whomsoever had offended me; and to him who had then asked of me concerning any matter, my answer would have been simply: Love! with a countenance clothed in humility."⁷ In other words, he conforms to one of the two commandments of Christ, on which "hang the Law and the Prophets"—"Thou shalt love thy

¹ Cf. *Purg.*, xxx, 22-24.

² *Il*, 51-52.

³ *Conv.*, III, xli, 114-18; *Purg.*, xxx, 31-33, 67-68.

⁴ *Epist.* x, 148-55.

⁵ ". . . ad recedendum a peccato et resistendum concupiscentiis . . . hoc pertinet ad incipientes [in caritate]."—II-II, qu. xxiv, a. 9.

⁶ *Il*, 53-59.

⁷ *xl*, 2-9.

neighbor as thy self." For by contemplation of Beatrice in the white of faith, he has been converted to faith, which purifies his heart of the inordinate desire of pride,¹ whereby man is set against not only God, but man.² Dante's charity, then, unresisted by pride, is become "proficient," that is, increasingly "secure from sin and persevering toward good."³ In the degree of his faith the invisible things of God reflected in Beatrice will be clearer than to his natural understanding.⁴

So, by meditation of Beatrice,⁵ that is, by his meditating the hoped-for blessedness, he has a vision—at once of promise and of warning. In his dream he sees Love as a man in the midst of a flaming cloud, in himself joyous, yet to the beholder dread. Of the many things Love speaks, he understands only the words: "I am thy Lord."⁶ Now in paradise, as we know, he sees the Lord Christ as a man in the midst of the triune luminous circle, direct image of the Godhead. Here in his dream the enveloping cloud has the flame color of divine charity. Indeed, as St. John says, "God is charity."⁷ Joyous is the charity of Christ, but dread to pride, which it drives out.⁸ In his dream he sees Beatrice, clothed only in the blood-red of her charity, sleeping in the arms of the Lord. The divine flame reflected in the creature colors the creature, but has no longer the divine lambency: human charity is only the duller likeness of divine charity. "*Who in Christ*, that is in the faith of Christ, *are fallen asleep*, that is are dead in the hope of salvation"—so Aquinas interprets the words of St. Paul.⁹ And the interpretation fits the

¹ "Fide purificans corda eorum."—*Act.*, xv, 9. And Aquinas: "Et ideo primum principium purificationis cordis est fides: quae si perficiatur per caritatem formatam, perfectam purificationem causat."—II-II, *qu.*, vii, a. 2.

² "... superbia semper quidem contrariatur dilectioni divinae. . . . Et quandoque etiam contrariatur dilectioni proximi."—II-II, *qu.*, cixii, a. 5.

³ Aquinas, II-II, *qu.*, xxiv, a. 9; *III Sent.*, d. XXIX, *qu.*, i, a. 8.

⁴ "... invisibilia Dei altiori modo . . . percipit fides quam ratio naturalis."—Aquinas, II-II, *qu.*, ii, a. 3.

⁵ *Cf. Purg.*, xxx, 133-35.

⁶ *Ill.* So in the last vision of the *Vita Nuova* (xlii), of the many things spoken to his heart, he understands only that it is his lady who has appeared to him. And in chap. xxiv he is told that "for great likeness" his Lord Love and his Lady are as one.

⁷ "Deus est caritas."—*I John*, iv, 8.

⁸ "Caritas repellit inordinatam passionem."—Aquinas, *Comm. I Cor.*, XIII, iii.

⁹ *Comm. I Cor.*, XV, ii.

image of Dante's vision.¹ Beatrice lives in the faith of Christ; she shall die in the hope of salvation. Then in his dream he sees her, awakened by Love, eat his burning heart. So awakened to life everlasting, she will wholly absorb his desire, transmute to her own perfect charity his consuming pride, his inordinate desires of the flesh and of the mind. Finally, he sees in his dream the compassionate Lord, bearing Beatrice away to heaven, weep for pity of the sinner who can reach true blessedness only by a "way of sighs" and paying the "toll of tears."

But Love's enigma is beyond Dante's present understanding. So he illustrates St. Paul's warning words: "Newly come to the faith . . . being lifted up with pride, he [falls] into the condemnation of the devil."² Between him and his "blessedness" "in a direct line" interposes herself "a gentle lady of most pleasing mien"; and her "for some months and years" he woos as a "screen" of his true love.³ Then, on her leaving him, he transfers, apparently at the dictation of true Love, his heart to a "new pleasure."⁴ And this lady he made, he says, so effectively his "defence" against the imputation of his wooing his true blessedness, Beatrice, that she, scandalized, denied him her *salute*, that is, the *salutation* in which lay his spiritual *safety* (for *salute* means both). Evidently, he must have misunderstood Love. In fact, in his imagination he had seen Love as a meanly clad "wanderer," "abject" and "abashed," "as if he had lost lordship," and ever lifting his eyes from earth to "a river fair, swift and very clear," flowing alongside Dante's way. Here manifestly is an enigma to be guessed, and again an allegorical interpretation by Aquinas is pertinent. In Scripture, he says, "under the similitude of a river is signified grace," abundant in gifts as a river in waters, having its source in God as a river in a high place, moving the heart suddenly to charity as a river all that is in it.⁵

¹ I do not assert that Dante himself had this passage, or any, of Aquinas in mind. He must indeed have known St. Paul's words; but he may of course have arrived at the image independently; and my interpretation here as elsewhere could be defended by an entirely different set of inferences.

² *I Tim.*, iii, 6.

³ *v.*

⁴ *ix*, 55. *Piacere* means sensual pleasure in *Inf.*, v, 104, and in the present context is explicitly opposed to blessedness (*beatitudine*). Otherwise, moreover, why should Beatrice be scandalized?

⁵ ". . . consolatio exprimitur sub similitudine fluminis, quod signat gratiam propter aquae abundantiam, quia in gratia est abundantia donorum. *Ps. lxiiv: Flumen*

So the love which is charity pursues the way of this life sustained by contemplation of grace, by faith ordering desire of transitory pleasures to desire of everlasting blessedness. As "gentle" the pleasing ladies reflected in their lesser degree the "gentlest" lady of blessedness—even transitory pleasures may accord with virtue;¹ but to follow them for their own sakes, inordinately, was to obey a love base and errant, to keep his eyes altogether on the visible things of earth, forgetting the invisible things of God.²

Lost is the *salute* of Beatrice, "destroyer of all vices and queen of virtue"; lost, that is, is the grace of blessedness fulfilled in charity, which, says Aquinas, "removes all motive to sin" and is "the mother of all virtues."³ From the depths of discouragement Dante calls upon his "lady of courtesy" for aid, as the also penitent St. Paul upon his Lord.⁴ And the "lord of nobleness," that is, of the spirit of charity, in a vision bids him⁵ to abjure the "pleasures," *simulacra* of himself, true Love, and to confess Beatrice, blessedness. But the visitant, white-robed in faith, weeps to find Dante not like himself "as a center of a circle to which all parts of the circumference have equal relation." It is the image, as reflected in the abstract understanding, the real image of God, seen in paradise as an effulgent center whose circumference is the circle of the spiritual universe, on which depends the material.⁶ So, moved by pride not charity, by passion not virtue, Dante is unlike God. When his soul shall conform on all sides to reason, active and speculative, shall be filled wholly with charity,

Dei repletum est aqua. Et quia derivatur a principio, scilicet fonte, sed non fons a flumine quia fons est in suo principio, et Spiritus sanctus est a Patre et Filio. Apoc. ult.: Ostendit mihi fluvium aquae vitae splendidum sicut chrysellum, procedentem a sede Dei et agni. . . . Sed aliqui sunt fluvii qui habent tardum motum: non est talis iste, quia est festinus . . . quia Spiritus sanctus gratia perfundit subito . . . [et] impetu . . . amoris movet cor.—*Comm. Ps.*, xlv, 3; cf. *Par.*, xxx, 61 ff.

¹ "Si enim aliquis appetit aliquam excellentiam sub deo, si moderate quidem appetit et propter bonum, sustineri potest . . . non est proprie superbia, nisi quando quis appetit excellentiam non ordinando illam ad Deum. Et ideo superbia proprie dicta separat a Deo."—Aquinas, *Comm. II Cor.*, XII, iii.

² "Effectus peccati duplex: scilicet inclinatio affectus ad terrena, et inordinatio ejus per aversionem a Deo."—Aquinas, *Comm. Ps.*, L.

³ ". . . caritas . . . excludit omne motivum ad peccandum."—II-II, qu. xxiv, a. 11. "Caritas est mater omnium virtutum."—I-II, qu. lxi, a. 4.

⁴ II Cor., xii, 8; cf. Aquinas, *Comm. Ps.*, L, 1; ". . . Implorat misericordiam et sic impetrat veniam."

⁵ V. N., xii.

⁶ *Par.*, xxviii, 41-42; 94-96; and cf. *supra*, p. 7.

"root of virtue" and "seed of blessedness," then will it indeed be, according to the symbol authorized also by Augustine and Aquinas, as "a center of a circle."¹

It is not expedient for him yet to understand. Only through penitence, paying its "scot of tears" to wash away pride, will his understanding clear. Meanwhile pride of passion and meekness of charity contend in his soul until he is brought to the brink of spiritual death, despair.² But from utter humiliation of self springs obedience to faith, as says Aquinas.³ Beatrice's will be done. And even in his confession of unworthiness of her grace he receives grace—and so comes to his "new theme and nobler than the past."⁴ By contemplation of the good in her, he is transformed to the good—in the degree of his imperfect vision.⁵ Having in that degree not only the will, but the understanding of charity, he can, developing Guinizelli's thought, declare charity as a "spirit of love" "according to truth and virtue," proper to man as a rational being, and as sublating "desire of the pleasing thing" "according to sensible appearance"—love, that is, shared by man with the brutes.⁶ He can declare the grace of charity coming from Beatrice's eyes "demonstrations of wisdom," and the blessedness of it beaming in her smile "persuasions of wisdom";⁷ and how her temporal beauty induces charity as "the principle of virtue" to subdue the natural vices, pride and wrath, and so leave the heart meek and at peace.⁸ And in Dante's heart,

¹ St. Augustine, *De quantitate animae*; Aquinas, *Contra gentes*, I, I, c. 66; cf. J. B. Fletcher, *The Religion of Beauty in Woman*, New York, Macmillan, pp. 53 f.; G. Busnelli, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 170 f.

² V. N., xiii-xvi; cf. *Ps.*, xvii, 3-4: "Circumdederunt me dolores mortis, et torrentes iniquitatis conturbaverunt me. Dolores inferni circumdederunt me: praecoccupaverunt me laquei mortis"; cf. Aquinas: ". . . ex iniquitatis homo inducitur ad mortem, et per mortem deducitur ad infernum."—*Comm. Ps.*, xvii, 3.

³ "Modus humiliationis est obedientia et signum humilitatis est obedientia, quia proprium superbiorum est sequi propriam voluntatem."—*Comm. Philipp.*, II, II.

⁴ V. N., xvii-xviii.

⁵ Cf. *II Cor.*, III, 28. "Nos vero omnes, revelata facie gloriam Domini speculantes, in eandem imaginem transformamur a claritate in claritatem, tamquam a Domini Spiritu." And Aquinas: "*Speculantes non sumitur hic a specula, sed a speculo, id est ipsum Deum gloriosum . . . cognoscentes per speculum rationis in qua est quaedam imago ipsius. Cum enim omnis cognitio sit per assimilationem cognoscentis ad cognitum, oportet quod qui vident, aliquo modo transformentur in Deum. Et si quidem perfecte vident, perfecte transformantur, sicut beati in patria per fruitionis unionem. . . . Si vero imperfecte, imperfecte, sicut hic per fidem.*"—*Comm. II Cor.*, III, III.

⁶ V. N., xx; cf. *Conv.*, III, III.

⁷ V. N., xix, 70-75; xxi, *passim*; cf. *Conv.*, III, xv, 12-20.

⁸ V. N., xxi; cf. *Conv.*, III, xv, 111-54.

so humbled, the lord of love, once dread,¹ now abides "gracious."²
So Beatrice will one day say:

Questi fu tal nella sua vita nuova
virtualmente, ch'ogni abito destro
fatto averebbe in lui mirabil prova. . . .
Alcun tempo il sostenni col mio volto;
mostrando gli occhi giovinetti a lui,
meco il menava in dritta parte volto.³

An illness reminds him of his mortality—and of hers. He may lose his moral stay. A "vain imagination" portends her death—*vain* so far as it seems to threaten real loss. Who should read its enigma aright, would see gain. Her imagined death is accompanied by portents like those at the Crucifixion, Christ's atonement.⁴ He sees her borne to heaven as a "white cloudlet"—white in the faith. (So is repeated the prediction of his first vision.) His instinctive cry—"Blessed, O fairest spirit, is he that beholdeth thee!"—intimates his conditional beatitude to come: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The awakening words—"Sleep no more. . . . Be not comforted"—are justified in the declaration of St. Paul: "It is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed."⁵ Like the sleeping Lady of his first vision, Dante will one day fall asleep in the arms of the Lord, and be awakened to the life of glory.

Presently a clearer revelation follows. In Dante's imagination, Love appears to come from where Beatrice, or blessedness, is; contagiously joyful, he draws analogy between Giovanna, the *Primavera* or "one who shall come before" Beatrice, and the forerunner of the True Light, John the Baptist. Having so clearly likened Beatrice to Christ, Love also identifies her "for great likeness" with himself. In other words, Beatrice is blessedness; blessedness is the love of God, charity; and charity is the Love who rules Dante.⁶

¹ "Di pauroso aspetto," III, 30.

² "Soave," xxviii, 17.

³ *Purg.*, xxx, 115-17, 121-23.

⁴ *V. N.*, xxiii, 35 f., 176 f.

⁵ *Rom.*, xlii, 11. The Vulgate *salus* is identical with the Italian *salute*.

⁶ xxiv. In *Par.*, xii, 80, Dante, after St. Jerome, explains the name Giovanna as meaning "grace of the Lord"; and we are given grace that we may hereafter receive the "true light."

The vicarious divinity of Beatrice, declared in this analogy, is later confirmed by outward signs.¹ People throng to gaze upon her as she goes "crowned and clothed in humility" as the multitudes followed him who declared himself "meek and lowly in heart," and sinners are miraculously converted at sight of her and by her words. Meditation of blessedness is incompatible with meditation of evil.²

Joyous in his sense of grace received, Dante now prays for "more grace" (*piu salute*).³ And his very prayer is interrupted by Beatrice's death. It is as if God had but waited for his fateful wish by divine irony to confer "more grace" even by taking away that which he seemed to have. He cannot understand. His soul sorrows, "forsaken by its salvation [*salute*]." Life is become a "tedious thing"; he longs for death.⁴

But on the anniversary of her death, thought of her rekindles love in his "destroyed heart."⁵ And that way, rightly followed, lies salvation. But since Beatrice is apparently lost to him, he gives his love to the Consoling Lady, whose tender pallor reminds him of the lost Beatrice's pearly hue. Because of her likeness to Beatrice, he argues, noblest love must be with her.⁶ But as before in the case of the *piaceri*, the sin of his desire is in its inordinateness. He grasps at the shadow, the *simulacrum*, for itself, letting go the substance. The *piaceri* were shadows of blessedness on earth; the Consoling Lady is the shadow of blessedness in heaven.

So again, pride—desire ordered not to God but to earthly things—is punished by discord within himself. Heart and soul, appetite and reason, in divorcement war against each other.⁷ "Evil desire," the "messenger of Satan," buffets him. He "blasphemes the vanity of his eyes," clouded mirrors wherein truth has been imaged too enigmatically for his understanding. But again from humiliation of self springs obedience: "One day, almost at the hour of noon,"⁸ "a mighty imagination" of Beatrice in the "noblest color" of charity recalls him to grace.

¹ xxvi-xxvii.

² "... cum beatitudo sit summum hominis bonum, non compatitur secum aliquod malum."—Aquinas, I-II, qv. II, a. 4.

³ xxviii, 25.

⁴ xxxiii-xxxiv.

⁵ xxiv.

⁶ xxxvi-xxxvii.

⁷ xxxviii-xxxix; cf. *Conv.*, II, Canz. I, 27-29, and commentary.

⁸ In mystic theology noon symbolizes love at its meridian.

Following for herself the Consoling Lady, semblance of Beatrice left behind her on earth, Dante is following the earthly life as divorced from the heavenly, or the active life as divorced from the contemplative. "Those," says Aquinas, "who set blessedness in the activities of the active life, to wit in moral activities, err. . . . And indeed these [cardinal] virtues are ways to blessedness, and not blessedness itself. Wherefore 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' It is not said, 'they see God,' for this would be blessedness itself."¹

Or in other analogous words, the Consoling Lady, taken for herself, is the letter of the Law, which without the spirit killeth, as St. Paul says. For, as Aquinas explains, the spirit in the gospel of charity removes the cause of sin, of which the Law merely gives knowledge, and renders worse by knowledge. By Christ's death, the "veil of the temple was rent," and the *glory* which Moses, receiver and declarer of the Law, had hid under a veil, was revealed. So by Beatrice's death should have been rent the veil between Dante and the glory of his blessedness; but in his blindness he had acted as the Jews who would not see the spirit of the gospel through the letter of the Law.² He had followed the street called Straight, but tarried in the half-way house, forgetting the way that led on. "For the disciple of Christ," says Aquinas, "there is a threefold degree of cognition. The first is from the clearness of natural cognition to the clearness of the cognition of faith. The second is from the clearness of cognition of the Old Testament to the clearness of the cognition of grace of the New Testament. The third is from the clearness of the cognition of nature and of the Old and New Testaments to the clearness of eternal vision."³ So far as Dante tarried behind with the Consoling Lady, his was only the clearness of cognition of the Old Testament; he lacked the grace of the New.

¹ "Illi autem qui ponunt beatitudinem in actibus activae vitae, scilicet moralibus, errant. . . . Et ideo istae virtutes sunt viae in beatitudinem, et non ipsa beatitudo. Et hoc est Beati mundo corde; quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt. Non dicit, Vident, quia hoc esset ipsa beatitudo."—*Comm. Mat.*, v, 2; cf. *Conz.*, IV, xxii; *De Mon.*, III, xvi. Confirmation may perhaps also be found in *Purg.*, II, 112 ff., where Dante and the others, in their enjoyment of "Amor che nella mente mi ragiona" (i.e., Philosophy, symbolized in the Consoling Lady), forget to strip off "lo Scoglio ch'esser non lascia a voi Dio manifesto." I am indebted for this suggestion to Professor C. H. Grandgent.

² *Hebr.*, x, 1.

³ *Comm. II Cor.*, III, II-III; cf. *Par.*, v, 76-78; xxiv, 88-93.

Grace rebestowed by Beatrice, Dante realizes his error. Like the pilgrims who, out of their *patria*, go seeking "the blessed image which Jesus Christ left us for ensample of his most beautiful countenance," he, a pilgrim *in via ad patriam* where his true blessedness is, now tarries with the earthly semblance, the "pallid" *simulacrum*. Let rather his "pilgrim¹ thought" rise to the heavenly reality. And his steps to this higher contemplation, intellectual charity, Dante indicates in the three sonnets of chap. xlii. The first—*Venite a'ntender*—recalls the seeming loss of his blessedness in Beatrice's death; the second—*Deh peregrini*—declares that his blessedness is not to be found in "the dolorous city" of this life;² the third—*Oltre la spera*—tells how his pilgrim thought, drawn by new intelligence through Love, deeper faith through charity, rises to behold his blessedness though still dimly through her splendor.

His intellectual vision is not yet pure enough to reflect clearly and openly the clear and open image of the divine sun in the glory of Beatrice. "Our intellect," he says, "is related to those blessed souls, as our weak eye is to the sun."³ Therefore to strengthen the weak eye of his mind, he concludes, "I study all I can."⁴ Thus he will attain perfect charity, so far as may be in this life. Or, in the words of Aquinas, "he directs his study toward devotion to God and divine things, ignoring all things else save as the necessity of this present life demands," and "habitually sets his whole heart on God, that is to say, thinks or wills nothing contrary to divine love." So by such merit and by grace of the theological virtues, Beatrice's last *salute*, he may in the life to come attain the perfect charity by which his heart shall be forever uplifted to God.⁵ In effect, the *practical* conclusion of the *Vita Nuova* and of the *Divina Commedia* is the same:

... già volgeva il mio disiro e il velle
 sì come rota ch'egualmente è mossa,
 L'amor che move il sole e l'altre stelle;—

¹ xli-xlii; cf. his pilgrim love in this higher stage with the pilgrim or errant (*peregrino*) love of the second vision (chap. ix). The allegorical point of chapter xli is repeated in *Par.*, xxxi, 103-17, where Dante explicitly compares himself to the pilgrim gazing absorbed on the "Veronica," and is rebuked by St. Bernard for not turning from the semblance to the reality of Christ.

² Cf. Dante's interpretation of the three Marys at the Tomb as an allegory of the active and contemplative life—(*Cons.*, IV, xxii).

³ xlii, 27-29.

⁴ xlii, 5-6.

⁵ "Ex parte vero diligētis caritas dicitur perfecta quando aliquis secundum totum suum posse diligit. Quod quidem contingit tripliciter. Uno modo, sic quod totum cor

i.e., "nihil cogitet vel velit quod sit divinae dilectioni contrarium." But through study of divine things, the dreamer of enigmatic visions of the *Vita Nuova*, the *somniator*, will grow to the *propheta* of the *Commedia*, not only seeing visions, but understanding them, and, like his prototype the apostle Paul, boldly declaring them "in honor of God and in service of his fellowman."¹

JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK CITY

hominis actualiter semper feratur in Deum. Et haec est perfectio caritatis patriae: quae non est possibilis in hac vita, in qua impossibile est, propter humanae vitae infirmitatem, semper actu cogitare de Deo et moveri dilectione ad ipsum. Alio modo, ut homo studium suum deputet ad vacandum Deo et rebus divinis, praetermissis aliis nisi quantum necessitas praesentis vitae requirit. Et ista est perfectio caritatis quae est possibilis in via: non tamen est communis caritatem habentibus. Tertio modo, ita quod habitualiter aliquis totum cor suum ponat in Deo: ita scilicet quod nihil cogitet vel velit quod sit divinae dilectioni contrarium. Et haec perfectio est communis omnibus caritatem habentibus."—II-II, qu. xxiv, a. 8.

¹ "Nisi enim ad similitudines sensibiles in imaginatione formatas intelligendas adsit lumen intellectuale, ille cui similitudines huiusmodi ostenduntur, non dicitur propheta, sed potius somniator. Ille dicitur prophetare qui per lumen intellectuale divinas visiones sibi et aliis factas, exponit. . . . Prophetia est ad honorem Dei et utilitatem proximorum."—Aquinas, *Comm. I Cor.*, XLV, 1. ". . . Molte cose, quasi come sognando, già veda: siccome nella *Vita Nuova* si può vedere."—*Contr.* II, xlii, 27-29.

THE ENAMORMENT OF BOCCACCIO

Autobiographical accounts of enamorment appear in five of the early works of Boccaccio, the *Filocolo*, the *Filostrato*, the *Fiammetta*, the *Ameto*, and the *Amorosa visione*. The consistent substance of these accounts is that Boccaccio fell in love with Maria at a Holy Saturday morning service in the church of San Lorenzo in Naples. The accounts in the *Filocolo* and the *Ameto* give the zodiacal date of the event: the sun, it is said, had reached the 16th degree of the sign Aries.

The veracity of this story has never been examined. Boccaccio specialists have taken its accuracy for granted; writers of histories of Italian literature have been inclined to doubt its worth. The matter deserves thorough examination, however, both because of its immediate biographical interest and because the zodiacal statements as to the date of the event are generally thought to furnish the key to the chronology of the youth of Boccaccio. In this study I shall first summarize each of the five accounts, then discuss their veracity, and finally examine the value of the statements as to the date.

I

In the prefatory portion of the *Filocolo*¹ Boccaccio first celebrates the noble birth and manifold excellence of his lady, Maria, and then begins the account of his enamorment as follows:

Avvenne che un giorno, la cui prima ora Saturno avea signoreggiata, essendo già Febo co' suoi cavalli al sedecimo grado del celestiale Montone pervenuto,² e nel quale il glorioso partimento del figliuolo di Giove dagli spogliati regni di Plutone si celebrava, io, della presente opera compositore, mi trovai in un grazioso e bel tempio in Partenope, nominato da colui che per deificarsi sostenne che fosse fatto di lui sacrificio sopra la grata, e quivi

¹ Florence, 1829, Vol. I (= *Opere volgari*, ed. I. Moutier, Vol. VII), pp. 1-9. The best general studies of the youth of Boccaccio and of his love for Maria are V. Crescini, *Contributo agli studi sul Boccaccio*, Turin, 1887, and A. Della Torre, *La giovinezza di Giovanni Boccaccio* (= *Collezione di opuscoli danteschi inediti o rari*, Nos. 79-82), Città di Castello, 1905.

² This phrase is ambiguous. It may mean either "the sun having reached the space constituting the 16th degree of Aries" or "the sun having reached in Aries the line of division which would be numbered and read 'degree 16.'" See note 3, pp. 5-6.

con canto pieno di dolce melodia ascoltava l'ufficio che in tale giorno si canta, celebrato da' sacerdoti successori di colui che prima la corda cinse umilmente esaltando la povertade quella seguendo. Ove io dimorando, e già essendo secondo che il mio intelletto estimava la quarta ora del giorno sopra l'orientale orizzonte passata, apparve agli occhi miei la mirabile bellezza della prescritta giovane . . . la quale sì tosto com' io ebbi veduta il cuore cominciò . . . a tremare. . . . Ma dopo alquanto spazio, rassicurato un poco, presi ardire, e intentivamente cominciai a rimirare ne' begli occhi dell' adorna giovane, ne' quali io vidi dopo lungo guardare Amore in abito tanto pietoso, che me, cui lungamente a mia istanza avea risparmiato, fece tornare, desideroso d' essergli¹ per così bella donna, subietto.

Boccaccio then prays Love to accept him as subject, and straightway a fiery arrow of gold speeds from Maria's eyes to his, passes through them to his heart, and kindles there an inextinguishable flame.

The account of the enamorment concluded, Boccaccio tells of another occasion, subsequent to the enamorment by *più giorni*, upon which he saw his lady. Upon this occasion he is welcomed into her company, the conversation falls upon the story of Florio and Biancofiore, and his lady requests him to set forth that story in a literary form befitting its merit, adjuring him "per quella virtù che fu negli occhi miei il primo giorno che tu mi vedesti, e a me per amorosa forza t' obbligasti." He, realizing that this is the first request made to him by his lady, replies that he will undertake the task; she thanks him; and he leaves her company. Thereafter, he says, "senza niuno indugio cominciai a pensare di voler mettere ad esecuzione quello che promesso avea." Then comes an invocation, in the course of which Boccaccio implies that he is engaged in the study of canon law; and then, with an address to his readers in which he says "non siate ingrati di porgere divote laudi a Giove e al nuovo autore," the preface comes to an end.

The account of enamorment in the *Filostrato*² appears in the main narrative, in the first part. The enamorment is ostensibly that of Troilo and Criseida. The time is spring; the place is the temple of Pallas in Troy. Criseida is present, dressed in her widow's black, and takes a place "assai presso alla porta." Troilo with some companions wanders about the temple, criticizing the ladies, making fun

¹ There should be a comma after *essergli*, and none after *tornare*.

² Florence, 1831 (= *Opere volgari*, Vol. XIII), Part I, stanzas 18-30.

of the gazing and sighing lovers, and rejoicing that he, who had once known both the joy and the greater bitterness of love, is now free-hearted:

Io provai già per la mia gran follia
Qual fosse questo maledetto fuoco.
E s' io dicessi che amor cortesia
Non mi facesse, ed allegrezza e giuoco
Non mi donasse, certo i' mentiria,
Ma tutto il bene insieme accolto, poco
Fu o niente, rispetto a' martirj,
Volendo amare, ed a' tristi sospiri. . . .

E benchè di veder mi giovi altrui,
Io pur mi guardo dal corso ritroso,
E rido volentier degl' impacciati,
Non so s' io dico amanti o smemorati.

Then he sees Criseida:

Ell' era grande, ed alla sua grandezza
Rispondean bene i membri tutti quanti,
Il viso aveva adorno di bellezza
Celestiale, e nelli suoi sembianti
Ivi mostrava una donnesca altezza;
E col braccio il mantel tolto davanti
S' avea dal viso, largo a sè facendo,
Ed alquanto la calca rimuovendo.

Piacque quell' atto a Troilo, al tornare
Ch' ella fe' in sè, alquanto sdegnosetto,
Quasi dicesse: non ci si può stare;
E diessi più a mirare il suo aspetto,
Il qual più ch' altro degno in sè gli pare
Di molta lode, e seco avea diletto
Sommo tra uomo e uom di mirar fiso
Gli occhi lucenti e l' angelico viso.

Before he knows it, the arrow has sped from her eyes to his heart. He accepts the love gladly, fearing only that if it is discovered he may be mocked in turn by the lovers he has been mocking.

The fact that Criseida is dressed in black is referred to four times;¹ Troilo's mocking of lovers is referred to ten times;² and his fear of retaliatory mocking, five times.³ In the course of the story it

¹ Stanzas 19, 26, 30, 38.

² Stanzas 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 50, 51.

³ Stanzas 31, 35, 51, 54, and stanza 8 in Part II.

turns out that Troilo and Criseida have seen each other before the enamorment.¹

The account of enamorment in the *Fiammetta*² appears in the main narrative, in the first book. It is Fiammetta's account of her own enamorment, and is therefore autobiographical only by secondary implication. Throughout the *Fiammetta* the parts are to a considerable extent reversed: experiences which were actually those of Boccaccio are here attributed to the heroine. The place of the enamorment is the church of San Lorenzo; the day is Easter Sunday. Fiammetta, brilliantly dressed, goes to the church, where, she says, "La vecchia usanza e la mia nobiltà m'aveano tra l'altre donne assai eccellente luogo serbato." She finds herself at once surrounded by an admiring circle of young men. Eventually she sees beyond the circle a lone youth leaning against a marble column and gazing at her as though already in love. From time to time she looks at him with increasing interest, and finally a ray of light speeds from his eyes to her heart, effecting the enamorment.

The young man's position, alone beyond a circle of admirers, is referred to four times in the account of the enamorment;³ and in the fifth book, in the account of Fiammetta's visit to Baia, it is stated that she is reminded of the enamorment by the mere formation of such a circle of admirers.⁴

¹ The two accounts just summarized are earlier than the remaining three. The *Filocolo* and the *Filostrato* were written while Boccaccio was living in Naples; the other three works were written after his return to Florence. Of the two Neapolitan accounts, that in the *Filocolo* is probably, though not certainly, the earlier. It is evident that work on the *Filocolo* was begun soon after the beginning of the courtship of Maria, and that the close of the preface, in which Boccaccio calls himself a *nuovo autore*, was written at an early date. The general character of the preface, moreover, renders it probable that it was actually written as a whole in the early stages of the composition of the book. The *Filostrato* was written before the success of Boccaccio's courtship of Maria (Crescini, in *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie*, III [for 1891-94], 384-88).

² Ed. G. Gigli (= *Bibliotheca romanica*, Nos. 120-22), Strassburg, pp. 26-31.

³ "Oltre a tutti, solo ed appoggiato ad una colonna marmorea, a me dirittissimamente uno giovane opposto vidi"; "me non meno pietoso che cauto rimirava tra uomo e uomo"; "esso, senza mutare luogo, cautissimo riguardava"; "Oh quante volte . . . biasimai io il suo dimorare agli altri di dietro, quella tiepidezza estimando, che egli usava a cautela; e già mi nojavano i giovani a lui stanti dinanzi, de' quali mentre io fra loro alcuna volta il mio intendimento mirava, alcuni, credendosi che il mio riguardare in loro terminasse, ei credertero forse da ma essere amati."

⁴ *Ed. cit.*, p. 103: "Ma poichè le danze in molti giri e volte reiterate avevano le giovani donne rendute stanche, tutte postesi con noi a sedere, più volte avvenne che gli vaghi giovani di sè d' intorno a noi accumulati, quasi facevano una corona, la quale mai nè quivi nè altrove avvenne che io vedessi, che ricordandomi del primo giorno, nel quale Panfilo a tutti dimorando di dietro, mi prese, che io invano non levassi più volte gli occhi fra loro rimirando, quasi tuttavia sperando in simil modo Panfilo rivedere."

The account of enamorment in the *Ameto*¹ appears in the story of Caleone, told by him to Fiammetta. The story is dominated by a literary motive, the predestination of Fiammetta to Caleone.² The statement of that predestination is effected by accounts of two preliminary visions of Fiammetta vouchsafed to Caleone, the one in his boyhood, the other in his youth. In those visions Fiammetta appears dressed brilliantly in green. The account of the enamorment begins as follows:

Ma la superna providenza disponente con eterna ragione le cose a' debiti fini, tenente Titan di Gradivo la prima casa un grado oltre al mezzo o poco più, un giorno, nella cui aurora avea signoreggiato lo Dio Saturno appo li Lazii, già per addietro stato per paura del figliuolo, e di quello già Febo salito alla terza parte, io entrai in un tempio da colui detto, che per salire alle case degl' Iddii immortali tale di sè tutto sostenne, quale Muzio di Porsenna in presenza della propria mano; nel quale ascoltando io le laudi in tal di a Giove per la spogliata Dite rendute, cantando li Flammini laudanti le poche sustanze di Codro, e per dovere obbligati a' soli bisogni della natura, rifiutando ogni più, voi singulare bellezza dell' universo, di bruna vesta coperta appariste agli occhi miei.³

¹ Florence, 1834 (in *Opere volgari*, Vol. XV), pp. 153-54.

² Crescini, *Contributo*, p. 108.

³ This account is so closely parallel to the *Filocolo* account in content and in the character and wording of its peculiar paraphrases as to render it evident that when Boccaccio wrote the *Ameto* passage he had the *Filocolo* passage before him, and was simply rephrasing the earlier statements:

tenente Titan di Gradivo la prima casa un grado oltre al mezzo o poco più,

un giorno, nella cui aurora avea signoreggiato lo Dio Saturno appo li Lazii, già per addietro stato per paura del figliuolo,

e di quello già Febo salito alla terza parte,

io entrai in un tempio da colui detto, che per salire alle case degl' Iddii immortali tale di sè tutto sostenne, quale Muzio di Porsenna in presenza della propria mano;

nel quale ascoltando io le laudi in tal di a Giove per la spogliata Dite rendute,

cantando li Flammini laudanti le poche sustanze di Codro, e per dovere obbligati a' soli bisogni della natura, rifiutando ogni più,

voi singulare bellezza dell' universo, di bruna vesta coperta appariste agli occhi miei.

essendo già Febo co' suoi cavalli al sedecimo grado del celestiale Montone pervenuto

un giorno, la cui prima ora Saturno avea signoreggiata

e già essendo secondo che il mio intelletto estimava la quarta ora del giorno sopra l' orientale orizzonte passata

io, della presente opera compositore, mi trovai in un grazioso e bel tempio in Partenope, nominato da colui che per edificarsi sostenne che fosse fatto di lui sacrificio sopra la grata

un giorno . . . nel quale il glorioso partimento del figliuolo di Giove dagli spogliati regni di Plutone si celebrava, io . . . quivi con canto pieno di dolce melodia ascoltava l' ufficio che in tale giorno si canta celebrato da' sacerdoti successori di colui che prima la corda cinesa umilmente esaltando la povertade quella seguendo

apparve agli occhi miei la mirabile bellezza della prescritta giovane

The zodiacal phrase "tenente Titan di Gradivo la prima casa un grado oltre al mezzo o poco più" must mean "the sun being in Aries, at or a little beyond the line of division

Caleone at once falls in love with Fiammetta, but does not recognize her as the lady of the visions. On the next day, Easter Sunday, he sees her again; she is then brilliantly dressed in green, and he recognizes her.

In the allegory of the *Amorosa visione*¹ Boccaccio, before seeing his lady, sees a fresco of the Triumph of Love in which she is represented.² He then enters a beautiful garden. The time of the entrance is indicated by the statement that the Sun's horses "mezzo il segno Dello Friseo monton co' piè teniano."³ In the garden he sees his lady amid a throng of other ladies, without being immediately enamored.⁴ Somewhat later, however, when he sees her again, her radiant beauty enamors him.⁵

II

I shall now endeavor to show that the story of the enamorment, as contained in these passages, cannot be regarded as certainly true, and that it should be regarded, nevertheless, as probably true in substance.

The account in the *Filocolo* is probably earlier than that in the *Filostrato*.⁶ Let us then imagine for the moment that the *Filostrato* is still unwritten, and that Boccaccio is planning the preface of the *Filocolo*. He has entered upon his courtship of Maria, and has

which would be numbered and read "degree 16," for the middle of the sign is the line of division which would be numbered and read "degree 15." This would seem at first sight to justify the second and exclude the first of the two possible meanings of the corresponding *Filocolo* phrase (see note 2, p. 1); but it is quite possible that Boccaccio may have written the *Filocolo* phrase with the first of the two meanings and then have been misled by its ambiguity when he came to rephrase it in the *Ameto*. Della Torre (p. 43) interprets the *Ameto* phrase as meaning "the sun being in Aries, somewhat more than half-way through a certain degree." This interpretation is syntactically impossible, and the parallelism with the *Filocolo* phrase proves that the *mezzo* must refer to the middle of the sign and not to the middle of a certain degree.

¹ Florence, 1833 (in *Opere volgari*, Vol. XIV).

² Chap. xv. Cf. Crescini, *Contributo*, pp. 117-25.

³ Chap. xl.

⁴ Chap. xliii. Cf. Crescini, *Contributo*, pp. 123-25.

⁵ Chap. xlv. The question of the relative order of these last three accounts does not concern the present argument. I regard the *Fiammetta* as probably earlier than the *Ameto* and the *Amorosa visione* because in the *Fiammetta* Boccaccio seems still distressed by the faithlessness of Maria, and gives no indication that he feels himself at home in Florence, whereas the mood of the *Ameto* and the *Amorosa visione* is calmer, and both works indicate a considerable acquaintance in Florentine society. The *Ameto* is referred to in the *Amorosa visione*, chap. xli.

⁶ See note 1, p. 4.

received from her the commission to write the story of Florio and Biancofiore.¹ It is obviously appropriate that the preface should contain a relation of Maria's request for the writing of the story; it would certainly be good literary and amatory judgment for him to prefix to that relation an account of the beginning of his love for Maria. It is desirable for the satisfaction of his own literary pride that that account should correspond to some earlier literary account of the beginnings of love; and it is highly desirable, for the effectiveness of the account upon Maria, that it should be as striking as possible.

The story of the enamorment as contained in the *Filocolo* is just such a story as might have been invented under such conditions. At the time when it was written Boccaccio was in all probability familiar with the two enamorments at temple service which appear in the *Roman de Troie*, that of Achilles and Polyxena and that of Paris and Helen; he was perhaps acquainted with some of the many instances of temple enamorment that occur in the Greek romances; and he may well have learned that in Avignon Petrarch was singing of a Good Friday church enamorment.²

One element of the account in the *Filocolo* (an element which reappears in the *Ameto*) is almost certainly fictitious: the representation of the Eastertide service as the first occasion upon which Boccaccio saw Maria. The *Filostrato* and the *Amorosa visione* imply that he had seen her before the enamorment; and the autobiographical story of Idalagos, which does not mention the enamorment, implies that he had seen her long before the beginning of the courtship.³ That such was the case is, moreover, inherently probable, for Maria was doubtless a prominent member of the court circle.

An instance of a fictitious story of enamorment is afforded by the *Fiammetta*, for the narrative of the enamorment therein contained is entirely fictitious as far as Maria is concerned; all the other versions of the affair represent her love as won only after long courtship.

¹ He may of course have started work upon the story before he received the commission.

² K. Young, *The Origin and Development of the Story of Troilus and Criseyde* (= *Chaucer Society Publications*, 2d series, No. 40), London, 1908, pp. 35-42. Petrarch's third sonnet apparently implies that the day of his enamorment was Good Friday, though its real implication is that the day was the anniversary of the Crucifixion.

³ Crescini, *Contributo*, pp. 123-26.

Boccaccio's general reputation for autobiographical veracity is none of the best. In the *Genealogia deorum* he makes a statement necessarily and emphatically implying his presence in Naples at the time of the examination of Petrarch before King Robert in March, 1341, while we know that he had left Naples by the first of January of that year.¹ In the introduction of the *Decameron*² he implies his presence in Florence at the time of the plague of 1348, while in the *Comento sopra la Commedia*³ he states that he was not in Florence at the time of the plague.

The account in the *Filocolo* contains two or three features that have a circumstantial look, but they are explicable without recourse to the supposition of the veracity of the story.⁴

So far as the *Filocolo* is concerned, therefore, the account of the enamorment may be merely a fiction devised for literary and amatory effectiveness. Nor is the case altered by the existence of the other four accounts. On the hypothesis that the *Filocolo* account is fictitious, the existence of the corresponding narratives is immediately explicable as due to the persistence of the same literary and amatory considerations which had led to the devising of the original fiction. There is ample proof that Boccaccio was very ready to repeat in a later work motives or incidents that had pleased him in an earlier one.⁵ The account in the *Ameto*, being simply a rephrasing of the account in the *Filocolo*,⁶ has not the slightest value as independent evidence. The accounts in the *Filostrato*, the *Fiammetta*, and the *Ameto* contain a few features that have a circumstantial look, but all are explicable without recourse to the supposition of the truth of the story.⁷ The story of the enamorment, therefore, cannot be regarded as certainly true.

On the other hand, there is nothing inherently improbable in Boccaccio's claim that he fell in love with Maria at a Holy Saturday service. The several literary accounts of temple or church enamorment rest ultimately upon social fact; the gathering of men and women for religious purposes induces enough social excitement and

¹ Cf. Della Torre, pp. 342-45.

² Ed. P. Fanfani, Florence, Le Monnier, 1857, I, 8.

³ Ed. G. Milanese, Florence, Le Monnier, 1863, II, 19.

⁴ See pp. 9-10.

⁵ See note 3, pp. 5-6.

⁶ Cf. Young, chap. II.

⁷ See pp. 9-10.

enough real or ostensible emotion to predispose the youthful fancy to thoughts of love. It is entirely possible, furthermore, that acquaintance with the literary accounts referred to above should have stimulated Boccaccio's actual experience; in other words, that he should have gone to an Eastertide service with a predisposition derived from those very accounts to accept love upon such an occasion.

There is no real inconsistency between any two of the accounts, except as to whether the Eastertide service was or was not the first occasion upon which Boccaccio saw Maria.

There are, moreover, in all the accounts except that of the *Amorosa visione*, certain features, as already stated, which have a circumstantial look, and although, as already stated, they are individually explicable without recourse to the supposition of the truth of the story, nevertheless, taken together, they seem to me sufficient to establish the probability that the story is true. These features are as follows: (1) The day of the enamorment, according to the *Filocolo* (and the *Ameto*), is Holy Saturday, not Easter Sunday, as we might have expected in a case of pure invention. In devising the certainly fictitious account of the enamorment of Fiammetta, in the novel of that name, it is Easter Sunday, not Holy Saturday, that Boccaccio selects. (2) In the *Filocolo* (and the *Ameto*) the zodiacal date is apparently specific. (3) The *Filocolo* and the *Filostrato* both mention, and the *Filostrato* emphasizes, the fact that Boccaccio had been in love before; such reference is, from a literary point of view, distinctly inappropriate. (4) The fact that the heroine is dressed in black is made prominent in the *Filostrato* and the *Ameto*. The mere mention of black dress in the *Filostrato* would not be significant, as Criseida is a widow, but the insistence upon it is rather striking. Maria would properly wear black at a Holy Saturday service, whereas she would of course dress brilliantly for an Easter Sunday service. (5) In the *Filostrato* Criseida's place in the temple is specified. (6) In the *Filostrato* Troilo's mocking of lovers in the temple is referred to ten times and his fear of retaliatory mocking five times. (7) In the *Filostrato* the gesture and attitude of Criseida that catch the attention of Troilo are specified. (8) In the *Filostrato* and the *Fiammetta* the position of the lover and the lady is clearly visualized—the lover gazing from outside a circle of admirers. (9) In the *Ameto*

the account of the enamorment includes two successive days, Saturday and Sunday. There is no literary precedent for such dualization of the account.¹

Finally, some weight should be given to the consistent impression of the Boccaccio specialists who have busied themselves with the autobiographical passages in the early works of Boccaccio. That impression is, as I have already indicated, that the story is essentially true.

In view of these several circumstances, therefore, I consider it probable, though not certain, that Boccaccio's love for Maria began at a Holy Saturday service in the church of San Lorenzo.

III

Upon that Holy Saturday, according to Boccaccio, the sun had reached the 16th degree of the sign Aries.² The enamorment, real or fictitious, certainly fell within the period 1331-38.³ Holy Satur-

¹ These features of the accounts may, however, be explained without recourse to the supposition that the story is true, as follows: (1, 2, 5, 7) The specification may be simply for the sake of increasing the impression of veracity. (1) Petrarch's Good Friday may have suggested Boccaccio's preference of Saturday to Sunday. (2) Boccaccio may have associated a fictitious enamorment with an actual Holy Saturday. The specification may be more apparent than real: the 16th degree (considered as space, not as line of division) is the second of the two middle degrees of the sign. The phrase may therefore be merely a vivid way of saying "the sun having reached the middle of Aries." In the *Amorosa visione*, it is to be noted, the zodiacal position of the sun is given as "the middle of Aries," without specification of the degree. (3-8) I have no doubt that each of these features has a basis in fact, but their association with the enamorment may nevertheless be artificial. (3) Boccaccio may have regarded it as a particular tribute to the amorous power of Maria that she enamored him in spite of a hostility to love due to a previous unhappy love experience. (4) Boccaccio made Criselda a widow, I am convinced, because he at that time (the *Corbaccio* was far in the future!) regarded the widow as the ideal mistress (cf. the ninth *questione d'amore* in the fourth book of the *Filocolo*, the 101st sonnet [probably later than the *Filostrato*] and Pucci's reply [Boccaccio, *Rime*, Florence, 1834 (in *Opere volgari*, Vol. XVI)], and Crescini, *Contributo*, p. 166). Insistence upon the sign of her widowhood is not then inexplicable. (4, 9) In the visions of the *Ameto* Fiammetta is dressed in green, which Boccaccio evidently regarded as her favorite color (cf. Crescini, *op. cit.*, p. 107). On Holy Saturday, however, Fiammetta would properly wear not green but black. Black, moreover, had already been specified as the color of the heroine's dress in the *Filostrato*. These considerations would be sufficient to suggest, for the *Ameto*, both the specification of the color and the non-recognition on Holy Saturday, which would in turn require an account of a subsequent meeting for recognition. (9) If the *Fiammetta* is, as I think, prior to the *Ameto* (see note 5, p. 6), the fact that the enamorment of Fiammetta is assigned to Easter Sunday may have suggested the inclusion of Easter Sunday in the *Ameto* enamorment.

² I am indebted to Professor F. R. Moulton for valuable suggestions with regard to some of the astronomical matters concerned in the remainder of this study.

³ The years mentioned are respectively the earliest and the latest proposed by any scholar within the last one hundred years (cf. Della Torre, chaps. II and IV). No year earlier than 1331 or later than 1338 could be proposed without disregard of facts concerning which there is no room for dispute.

day, within that period, fell upon the following dates: March 26 (1334), 30 (1331 and 1336), April 3 (1333), 11 (1338), 15 (1335), 18 (1332), 19 (1337).¹ In connection with this series of dates the zodiacal statement seems to offer a means of identification of the Holy Saturday in question.

But is the zodiacal dating exact? The scholars who have dealt with the matter have assumed that it was exact to the best of Boccaccio's knowledge.² That assumption is not justifiable. When Boccaccio started to write the zodiacal phrase in the *Filocolo* he certainly had in mind a particular Holy Saturday, but it is quite possible that he did not have in mind the exact calendar date of that Holy Saturday. If he did not, it is quite possible (most obviously so if the account as a whole is fictitious) that instead of looking up the calendar date and translating it into terms of the zodiac he was careful only that the zodiacal date should be approximately accurate, or even only that it should be appropriate for Eastertide in general. His actual zodiacal date is just such as might have been selected in such a way, for it is eminently appropriate for Eastertide in general. Whatever the exact opinion of Boccaccio as to the date of the sun's arrival at the 16th degree of Aries, he certainly thought of that arrival as occurring near the end of March;³ and the end of March is the point of calendar division between the two months within which Easter falls. It is even possible, as already noted,⁴ that the *Filocolo* phrase was not specific in the intention of Boccaccio, but was merely a vivid way of saying "the sun having reached the middle of Aries." It is therefore quite possible that the zodiacal date of the *Filocolo* was not intended to designate a particular calendar day.

On the other hand, it is probable, as has been shown, that the account of the enamorment is essentially true, and that the preface of the *Filocolo* was written not long after that event.⁵ It

¹ E. Schwartz, *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln* (= *Abhandlungen der kön. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., N.F. VIII* [1904-5], No. 6).

² F. Torraca in his recent *Per la biografia di Giovanni Boccaccio* (Milan, 1912) at first expresses doubt as to the exactness of the phrase, arguing (pp. 11-20) that Boccaccio perhaps had no specific opinion as to the relation of the zodiac to the calendar (for criticism of this argument see note 2, p. 12), but a little later (pp. 29-35) assumes its exactness for the purposes of an argument of his own as to the date of the enamorment (see note 3, pp. 16-17).

³ See pp. 12-16.

⁴ See note 1, p. 10.

⁵ See note 1, p. 4.

is therefore probable that Boccaccio, when writing the preface of the *Filocolo*, did have in mind the calendar day of the enamorment. It is further probable that when he wrote that preface he had completed his enthusiastic study of astronomy with Andalò di Negro,¹ and that he had heard Andalò discuss the question of the relation of the zodiac to the calendar.² It is therefore probable that the zodiacal date in the *Filocolo* is to the best of Boccaccio's knowledge an exact rendering of the actual calendar date of the enamorment. A correct retranslation of the zodiacal date into calendar terms should therefore yield the probable date of the enamorment.³

Boccaccio nowhere states his opinion as to the relation of the zodiac to the calendar. It is probable, as just implied, that his opinion on this point was derived from the teaching of Andalò di Negro. Two of the works of Andalò, the *Opus praeclarissimum*

¹ On Boccaccio's study with Andalò see my "Calmeta," in *Modern Language Notes*, XXI (1906), 212. Andalò died at an advanced age shortly before June, 1334 (G. Bertolotto in his edition of the *Opus praeclarissimum astrolabij* of Andalò in *Atti della società ligure di storia patria*, XXV [1892], 59).

² Della Torre, pp. 45-50. Della Torre points out that in the autobiographical story of Idalagos, in the long account of the instruction in astronomy received by Idalagos from Calmeta (who represents Andalò: see my article referred to in the preceding note), it is said that Calmeta spoke of the "coluro d' ariete. . . . con lo equinozio del detto segno." The vernal equinox coincides with the entrance of the sun into Aries (see note 3, p. 13). He points out also that Andalò discusses the relation of the zodiac to the calendar specifically, mentioning the date of the sun's entrance into Capricorn, in the *Tractatus teorice planetarum*, a copy of which was owned by Boccaccio. Torraca (pp. 11-20) doubts Boccaccio's reception of any instruction on this point. He argues first that Idalagos does not say that Calmeta specified the date of the vernal equinox. It may be replied that the fact that Idalagos does not say so does not by any means indicate that Calmeta did not specify the date: the story is entirely too brief and too allegorical for application of the argument *ex silentio*. Torraca argues further that Boccaccio does not specify the date of the vernal equinox in either of two cases, in the works of erudition, in which he might have done so. Here again the argument *ex silentio* does not seem to me properly applicable. Torraca does not mention the specific statement of Andalò in the *Tractatus*, nor the fact of Boccaccio's ownership of a copy of that work.

³ Several attempts to effect this retranslation were made in the course of the nineteenth century, but they were vitiated, in every case, by a lack of knowledge of mediaeval astronomical opinion on the matters concerned. A far better attempt was made by Della Torre (*op. cit.*, chap. II), who utilizes as evidence the works of Andalò. Della Torre deserves high credit both for the introduction of this important material, which renders possible a far more satisfactory solution of the problem than could otherwise be attained, and for the complete refutation of the earlier erroneous arguments. Della Torre's conclusion, however, is only partially correct, and his work is so marred by errors and omissions that it cannot be regarded as definitive. For a specific criticism of his work see note 3, pp. 16-17. A recent attempt at solution on the part of Torraca seems to me to rest upon mistaken premises; see note 3, pp. 16-17.

*astrolabij*¹ and the *Tractatus teorice planetarum*,² contain indications of his opinions as to the relation in question.³

The fourth chapter of the *Opus* contains directions for the construction upon the reverse of an astrolabe of the circles representing the calendar, and for the adjustment of their divisions to the divisions

¹ See note 1, p. 12. The date of the composition of the *Opus* is not known.

² Preserved in the Laurentian MS, XXIX, 8, which was once the property of Boccaccio. The passages necessary for the present argument are quoted or summarized by Della Torre, pp. 49, 52. The date of the composition of the *Tractatus* is not known.

³ The index of opinion as to the relation of the zodiac to the calendar is opinion as to the date of the vernal equinox, which coincides with the entrance of the sun into Aries, the first sign of the zodiac. The time of the vernal equinox is determinable either by observation or by computation on the basis of recorded observations. The mean Julian year contained 365 days, 6 hours. The solar year, represented by the zodiac, contains 365 d. 5 h. 48 m. 46 s. As a result of this difference the Julian year gained slowly on the solar year, and the vernal equinox therefore retroceded toward the beginning of the year. The Julian leap-year contained actually 366 days, and the Julian common year 365 days; the retrocession was therefore complicated by a quadrennial cyclic variation. If in a given leap-year the vernal equinox occurred at a given hour x , in the following year it occurred at $x+6$ h. -11 m. 14 s.; in the next year, at $x+12$ h. -22 m. 28 s.; in the next year, at $x+18$ h. -33 m. 42 s.; and in the next year, a leap-year, at $x-44$ m. 56 s. Summaries of the opinions of mediaeval astronomers with regard to the retrocession are given by F. Kaltenbrunner, "Die Vorgeschichte der Gregorianischen Kalenderreform," *Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akad. der Wissenschaften* (Vienna), Phil.-Hist. Kl., XVIII (1876), Heft III, pp. 289-315, and D. Marz, "La questione della riforma del calendario," *Pubblicazione del r. ist. di studi superiori di Firenze*, 1896, pp. 1-8. Cf. also E. Moore, *The Time-References in the Divina Commedia*, London, 1887, pp. 14-16, 118-21. The observation of the vernal equinox was a difficult one for mediaeval astronomers. They usually formed their opinion as to its time by computation on the basis of a few early recorded observations. The results were usually regarded as correct within an hour. Opinions differed as to the length of the solar year and its consequent difference from the mean Julian year. Ptolemy (140 A.D.) gives the difference as 4 m. 48 s.; Albatagni (ninth century), 13 m. 36 s.; Conrad (c. 1200), 12 m.; Robert of Lincoln (c. 1225) follows Ptolemy; the Alfonsine Tables (c. 1250), 10 m. 44 s.; Giovanni Campano (c. 1250) is uncertain whether Ptolemy or Albatagni is right; Roger Bacon (1267), 11 m. 30 s.; an anonymous writer (1273) and Gordianus (c. 1300), 12 m. In 46 A.C., when the Julian calendar was established, the vernal equinox fell on March 25. Ptolemy states that in 140 A.D. it fell on March 22. In 325 it was determined for the Nicæan Council that it fell on March 21. Conrad says that it occurs about March 15; John Holywood (1232) gives the date as March 15; Robert of Lincoln, as March 14; upon the astrolabe described in the *Libros dell astrolabio llano* due to Alfonso the Wise (c. 1250) the vernal equinox falls on March 13 (*Libros del saber de astronomia del rey D. Alfonso X de Castilla*, ed. M. Rico y Sinobas, Madrid, Vol. II, 1863, p. 291); Giovanni Campano states in one passage that it falls on March 14 and in another that it falls on March 15; Roger Bacon, by observation, places it, for 1267, on March 13; an anonymous writer (1273) gives its time as March 14 d. 20 h.; Gordianus, as March 15; Paolo da Perugia (c. 1340) as March 14 d. 12 h. (Della Torre, pp. 53-54). The actual dates of the vernal equinox in the lifetime of Andalò (c. 1250-1334) were as follows (C. L. Largeteau, "Tables abrégées pour le calcul des équinoxes et des solstices," in *Mémoires de l'Acad. des sciences de l'Inst. de France*, XXII [1850], 477-89): in leap-years, on March 12; in years first in a series of three common years, from 1253 to 1281 on March 13, from 1285 to 1333 on March 12; in years second in a series of three common years, from 1250 to 1314 on March 13, from 1318 to 1334 on March 12; in years last in a series of three common years, on March 13. In the period 1331-38 it fell on March 12, except in 1331 and 1335, when it fell on March 13.

of the circles upon the same surface which represent the zodiac. The sentence that indicates the position of the vernal equinox¹ is this: "Item pone regulam in centro et in gradibus .i. .m. .xxvi. arietis et ibi erit finis .xv. diei martii."² A zodiacal degree is virtually equivalent in length to a day.³ The vernal equinox, therefore, would fall on March 14, a little after the middle of the day.⁴ The day of the astrolabe is unquestionably the astronomical day, which in the usage of Andalò, as in that of modern astronomers, began at noon and received the same calendar number as the civil day beginning at the preceding midnight.⁵

If then Andalò's statement in the presence of Boccaccio was based upon the opinion indicated in the *Opus*, it was probably such

¹ See preceding note.

² *Ed. cit.*, p. 91. The figures are repeated in a table on p. 92.

³ When the sun is in Aries a degree is longer than a day by about half an hour.

⁴ The exact time would be not earlier than March 14 d. 12 h. 44 m. and not later than March 14 d. 13 h. 19 m. These exact figures are not necessary to the argument: I therefore omit the rather long calculation by which they are derived. Della Torre (pp. 50-53), working on the same data, gets the specific result March 14 d. 12 h. 53 m. (Della Torre does not express this result, but the result he does express, March 14 d. 6 h. 53 m., is derived through the result March 14 d. 12 h. 53 m. by his reduction of astronomical to civil time; see the next note); but he proceeds upon the supposition that the *motus solis in una die* is constant (whereas it really varies slightly from day to day) and upon the supposition that the data of the *Opus* are intended to be correct to the zodiacal second (whereas it is evident, since the zodiacal second is in no case specified, that they are intended to be correct only to the zodiacal minute). The adjustment of the zodiac to the calendar as indicated upon the astrolabe is probably intended to be correct within an hour (see note 3, p. 13). It is uncertain what relation this adjustment has to the quadrennial variation in the length of the Julian year (see note 3, p. 13). The astrolabe allots twenty-eight days to February: the possibility that the adjustment represents the facts of correspondence in a leap-year is therefore excluded. It may represent the average correspondence for a full four-year cycle, the average correspondence for a series of three common years, the correspondence obtaining in the first of a series of three common years, that obtaining in the second year of such a series, or that obtaining in the third year of such a series.

⁵ Boccaccio, *Genealogia deorum*, I, 33 (cited in part by Torraca, p. 30): "Dierum uero naturalium initium non aequae nationibus omnibus sumitur. . . . Vmbri qui & Hetrusci sunt, a meridie illi fecere principium, & in sequentis diei meridiem terminabant, quae consuetudo adhuc ab astrologis obseruatur" (ed. I. Micillus, Basle, 1532, p. 27). Boccaccio must have known, and cannot have ignored, the usage of Andalò. Della Torre (pp. 52-53), being unacquainted with this passage of the *Genealogia*, holds that in the usage of Andalò the astronomical day began at sunset and received the same calendar number as the civil day beginning at the preceding midnight. He points out that this was the usage of Paolo da Perugia; but there is no reason to think that the usage of Andalò was identical with that of Paolo. He argues further that Boccaccio followed this usage, adducing as evidence a passage in the *Fiammetta* in which it is related that Fiammetta every day at sunset added a pebble to the collection by which she kept record of the days of Panfilò's absence. But it is clear, as Torraca remarks (p. 30), that Fiammetta selected sunset for this ceremony simply because it marked the end of the "artificial" day—the 12-hour day extending from sunrise to sunset.

as to lead Boccaccio to associate the vernal equinox with one of the two civil days March 14 and March 15.¹

In the *Tractatus* Andalò says, in the course of a general discussion of the retrocession of the equinoxes, "Nunc autem intrat sol in capricorno die 14 decembris."² It is uncertain whether Andalò is here speaking in terms of the astronomical or the civil day.

The opinion indicated by this statement is apparently at variance with the opinion indicated by the adjustment of the zodiac to the calendar in the *Opus*, for according to the conditions of that adjustment the entrance of the sun into Capricorn falls on December 15 at about the ninth hour of the day.³ The statement of the *Tractatus*, therefore, probably indicates an opinion as to the relation of the zodiac to the calendar different from that expressed in the *Opus* in that the several points of the zodiac are advanced one day upon the calendar.⁴

If then Andalò's statement in the presence of Boccaccio was based upon the opinion indicated in the *Tractatus*, it was probably such as to lead Boccaccio to associate the vernal equinox with one of the two civil days March 13 and March 14.⁵

¹ If Andalò said "the vernal equinox falls upon March 14" without specifying "astronomical time," Boccaccio may have associated it with the civil day March 14. If the teaching was subsequent by twenty years to the composition of the *Opus*, the retrocession (see note 3, p. 13) would have brought the vernal equinox into the civil day March 14 (Andalò accepted the dictum of Ptolemy as to the rate of the retrocession; see note 3, p. 13, and Della Torre, p. 49). It is barely possible that Andalò made a statement from which Boccaccio could have inferred that the vernal equinox fell on the civil day March 13. This possibility results from the unlikely combination of the suppositions that the astrolabe is adjusted for the correspondence between zodiac and calendar obtaining in the last of a series of three common years (see note 4, p. 14) and that Andalò's statement was in terms of the correspondence obtaining in leap-years.

² Della Torre, p. 49.

³ According to the *Opus* table referred to in note 2, p. 14, the position of the sun at the end of the 15th day of December is Capricorn 0° 37'. The exact time of the entrance into Capricorn, according to the *Opus*, would be not earlier than December 15 d. 9 h. 17 m. and not later than December 15 d. 9 h. 44 m. The apparent variation in the statements may possibly be due merely to the choice of a different year or average of years in the four-year cycle as basis for statement. It is explicable, for example, on the combination of the suppositions that the astrolabe of the *Opus* is adjusted for the last of a series of three common years and that the *Tractatus* statement is in terms of the correspondence obtaining in leap-years.

⁴ Such an opinion would as a matter of fact be more correct than that expressed in the *Opus*; see note 3, p. 13.

⁵ It is barely possible that Andalò made a statement from which Boccaccio could have inferred that the vernal equinox fell on the civil day March 12. Cf. note 9, p. 000.

Upon the basis of the indications of Andalò's opinion in the *Opus* and the *Tractatus*, then, it is probable that Boccaccio placed the vernal equinox on one of the three days March 13, 14, 15.

A zodiacal degree is virtually equivalent in length to a day.¹ The phrase "essendo già Febo co' suoi cavalli al sedecimo grado del celestiale Montone pervenuto" may mean either "the sun having reached the space constituting the 16th degree of Aries" or "the sun having reached, in Aries, the line of division which would be numbered and read 'degree 16.'"² If it has the first meaning, Boccaccio may have had in mind a calendar date as early as March 28. If it has the second meaning, Boccaccio may have had in mind a calendar date as late as April 1.

The period thus defined, March 28–April 1, contains only one of the days upon which Holy Saturday fell in the years in question: March 30, which was the date of Holy Saturday both in 1331 and 1336. The date of the enamorment, therefore, was probably either March 30, 1331, or March 30, 1336.³

¹ See note 3, p. 14.

² See note 2, p. 1, and note 3, pp. 5–6.

³ Della Torre reaches the same conclusion, but his argument is invalid. His conclusion rests upon the assumption that the zodiacal phrase necessarily has the first of the two meanings noted as possible, and upon the claim that Boccaccio placed the vernal equinox on March 14 at 6.53 A.M. That claim, based upon the statement of the *Opus*, ignores the statement in the *Tractatus*. It ignores also the possibility that the statement made by Andalò in the presence of Boccaccio may have been general (like the statement in the *Tractatus*) rather than particular, the possibility that that statement was made in terms of the correspondence of the zodiac to the calendar obtaining in a year or series of years different from that chosen for the adjustment of zodiac to calendar in the *Opus*, the possibility that Boccaccio understood as referring to civil time a statement made by Andalò in terms of astronomical time, the possibility that the time indicated by Andalò in his statement in the presence of Boccaccio differed from the time indicated in the *Opus* as a result of correction for retrocession occurring after the composition of the *Opus*, the probability that the adjustment of the zodiac to the calendar as indicated upon the astrolabe is intended to be correct only within an hour, and the minor facts that the data of the *Opus* are supposed to be correct only to the zodiacal minute and that the *motus solis in una die* is not constant. It rests also upon the erroneous notion that the astronomical day, in the usage of Andalò, began at sunset (see note 5, p. 14). Torracca (pp. 29–35), after rejecting the argument of Della Torre (on invalid grounds; see note 2, p. 12), proposes in its place an argument based upon the supposition that Boccaccio associated the vernal equinox with the date March 18. He shows reason to believe that there existed in Tuscany, in Boccaccio's time, a popular belief that the vernal equinox did fall upon that date. He offers, as evidence that Boccaccio was acquainted with that belief, the following passage of the *Ameto*: "I festevoli giorni dalla reverenda antichità dedicata a Venere, sono presenti, tenendo Apollo con chiaro raggio il mezzo del rubatore di Europa." Torracca interprets this as meaning "May 1, the sun being precisely at the middle of Taurus," and then argues that if the vernal equinox fell on March 18 the sun would reach the middle of Taurus on May 1, whereas according to the *Opus* of Andalò the sun on that day would be well past the middle of the sign. But the precision of Torracca's

I expect to show in a later publication, by non-astronomical evidence, that the enamorment cannot have occurred as early as 1331.

My conclusions with regard to the enamorment of Boccaccio are therefore that his love began probably, though not certainly, at a Holy Saturday service in San Lorenzo, and that the date with which he associated his enamorment was probably, though not certainly, March 30, 1336.

ERNEST H. WILKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

interpretation is quite unwarranted, both in its supposition that the plural "I festevoli giorni" means "May 1" and in its supposition that "tenendo Apollo . . . il mezzo del rubatore di Europa" refers to a particular degree. Moreover, if the sun entered Taurus on the 17th of April, as it would (according to Torraca) if the vernal equinox fell on March 18, it would reach the exact middle of Taurus *not* on May 1, but on May 2. Surely it is extremely improbable that Boccaccio derived his opinion as to the date of the vernal equinox from an antiquated Tuscan popular belief rather than from the professional astronomer with whom he studied enthusiastically at Naples—an astronomer who, in a work of which Boccaccio owned a copy, discusses specifically the question of the retrocession of the equinoxes.

STANDARDS OF SPEECH AND THEIR VALUES

It should be clear at the start that the question of the way in which standards in speech are established and the question of the values of these standards are not one and the same but two separate and distinct matters. In determining standards one has to do with objective facts, like the descriptive material of geological science; but in determining values, our concern is with matters purely relative, with conclusions that must be based upon opinions and judgments and which need not necessarily appeal to all men in the same way. The naïve observer of language simplifies matters by assuming that when he has established his standard he has also established his test of values. The custom of his own group is for him the only standard, and also the ultimate test of right and wrong. And this naïve sense of satisfaction with what is familiar runs through all stages of language from the highest to the lowest. The shining member of "good society" needs no proof that the customs of his speech are the best, and the country yokel is just as sincerely convinced that the stranger from the city makes a fool of himself every time he uses a word out of the local manner. Kaffir children, we are told, are fond of playing at being missionaries, and one of the most amusing features of the game to them consists in speaking the native idiom with a missionary accent. The boys and girls of Siena, doubtless also of other places much frequented by travelers, have a somewhat similar game. They like to play at being tourists, and they show their contempt for the outsider's Italian and their superiority over him by substituting the infinitive for all the inflected forms of the verb.

The formation of standards is a necessary and a continual process in the growth of language. It is a first condition of speech that it shall be intelligible, and, as consequent to this, that there shall be a degree of common understanding as to the forms and the meanings of the elements of the language. But after the mere necessities of intelligibility have been satisfied there is still another unifying influence to be added. This is the universal human passion for

homogeneity, the instinct for imitation and repetition, which, though never carried out to the end of absolute regularity, continually tends in that direction. These two influences work together to bring about uniformity in language; first, the necessity of a common and accepted understanding of the forms of language, and second, the tendency or habit of mankind to repeat actions as exactly as possible and thus to reduce the number of actions from complete heterogeneity to groups of at least approximate similars.

Complete homogeneity is probably never attained in any group of actions, nor is it demanded by the practical requirements of the use of language. Communication takes place to a large extent through the suggestive power of the symbols of speech, not through any absolute meaning which might be supposed to be inherent in them. The actual understanding of speech is thus effected through a subjective synthesis which each person under every differing set of circumstances makes for himself. The speaker or writer strives to use such terms as will cause the hearer or reader to make a synthesis like his own, but a very little experience in the analysis of language tells him that the most he can attain is a general similarity, that his speech never can have the precise and exact meaning of an algebraic formula. In all practicable use of language there is, therefore, in the act of communication what might be called an area of negligible variation. Communication is not perfect, but the imperfections of it may be ignored in favor of that sense of sympathy and harmony which arises when two people think they understand each other, when they are agreed to assume that the subjective synthesis which each makes is the same.

By looking at language in some such way as this we are prepared to consider the questions how and why standards of speech arise. Every man is necessarily a member of some community group, and yet no group is absolutely homogeneous. Since absolute homogeneity is wanting, there can be no such thing as absolute standard and regularity. The question of standards is one of the degree of unity and regularity, and, by consequence of the extent of this area, of negligible variation.

Now in the establishing of the customs and habits of speech, it is a general law that the degree of homogeneity or unity varies

inversely to the extent of the area over which the fact of language under consideration is spread. This law becomes apparent by illustration. The greatest degree of similarity in the use of language is manifestly to be found in the most closely united social group, say in the family. Among members of such a group, the subjective synthesis which makes for understanding in language is most complete. Certain forms of speech will be used only among the members of the family in their family relations, and these will often be the very forms which give the group its deepest sense of intimacy and unity. But enlarging now the limits of inclusion so as to take in the customs and habits of the speech common not merely to the members of a family but to the citizens of a town, obviously we arrive at a new standard of homogeneity which has been attained by excluding from the standard the various distinctive uses which give the members of the smaller groups, the families, their peculiar sense of unity and homogeneity. The standard of the town includes a larger circle of speakers, but the ideas which it is able to express are correspondingly broader and more general, and in pronunciation the cadences of speech and the colors of sounds are less numerous and individual. Extending the circle of inclusion still farther, one may establish a grouping of similars in speech habits which will include many towns, all the speakers of a certain region, or all the speakers of a country. Every extension of the limits of inclusion geographically and numerically, however, carries with it a limitation of the number of speech habits which the members of the groups have in common. A standard of national use in speech means a grouping of those features of speech which the nation as a whole possesses in common. By the aid of these features the citizen of the nation acquires a means for expressing a feeling for a national unity, for a race. This feeling is also the result of a subjective synthesis, and it arises in the same way as the feeling for the unity of the family. But how vastly greater is the area of negligible variation in arriving at the feeling for a national or race unity, as compared with the feeling for family unity! In both instances we arrive at a standard by combining those similarities of speech which together make up the common speech habits of a group. The standard is therefore not an artificial system of regulations placed upon the language from

without, but its artificial character consists merely in that it states formally and analytically those habits which have worked themselves out unconsciously in the daily practice of speech. The question of the following of models, of right and of wrong, has consequently very little to do with the formation of standards of speech. These latter grow automatically in the practical everyday world of pleasure and business, they are the machinery of habits which men form in order to reduce the unavoidable friction of social intercourse. The machinery may be of very slight grasp, but capable of correspondingly fine workmanship; or its grasp may be practically coextensive with the limits of the speech, and then its powers will be wide rather than deep.

It will not have escaped the observation of the student of language that the processes which have been indicated as the method of the formation of standards are precisely the processes of the growth of dialects. In its popular sense, the term dialect is understood to mean a group of speech characteristics differing from, and inferior to, an approved standard. A derogatory sense has thus attached itself to the term. No one wants to confess that he speaks a dialect, although he may agree that all his neighbors do. But scientifically it is obvious that there is no difference between a dialect in the popular sense and a standard of speech, that is, a group of related speech customs, except that sometimes the standard may be made an object of conscious reflection and acceptance. But any dialect if it is thus treated may manifestly become a standard.

The same principles of inclusion and of negligible variation apply to dialects as to standards. No completely homogeneous dialect can be supposed to exist. The unity of the dialect must be found either in the personal sense of harmony of the users of it, or in the theoretical classifications of the student, who groups together those similars which he regards as characteristic and makes them the base of his artificial dialect divisions. And in the same way, the greater the comprehensiveness of the dialect, the less its intimacy and the complexity of its powers of expression. The English language as a whole has a unity of its own. Certainly it is distinct from French and German, and if in no other way than relatively, the English-speaking person acquires a feeling for a general language homo-

geneity. But imagine anyone trying to speak this standard unified English! Since it must include only those elements which are common to all English-speaking peoples, it must exclude everything which is distinctive of any minor group, of the Englishman as distinguished from the American, of the Devonshire Englishman as distinguished from the standard Englishman, of the Virginia American as distinguished from the standard American, and so down through an almost unlimited series of exclusions. When all these exclusions have been made, something will remain, in fact a good deal will remain. There will be left that central core of linguistic correspondences by virtue of which English is a language distinct from all other languages. The exclusions would represent the destructive habits, the differentiating tendencies of the speech, but the central body of standard usages would represent the homogeneous customs and habits by virtue of which a feeling for the language as a whole has been kept alive. This central body of standard uses is in modern times obviously more an eye standard than an ear standard, and, in practical speech, significant more as an ideal than as something actually to be realized.

From this extreme standard English dialect, which distinguishes English as a language from other languages, and which is established on the principle of the maximum of inclusiveness, that is, the greatest number of language forms common to the greatest number of English-speaking people, the limitations proceed down through many degrees. The standard British dialect by the same principle would be speech made up of the greatest number of forms common to the greatest number of dwellers in Britain, the standard American, by the common speech of the greatest number of Americans, the standard Virginian, by the common speech of the greatest number of Virginians, and so through all the countless groups which have in varying degrees a feeling for a homogeneous speech community.

Dialects or standards based upon geographical distribution are, however, not the only kinds that may be established. Within one and the same geographical area there exist necessarily different strata or groups of speech customs which have indeed more practical significance in the daily use of the art of language than the larger and more general distinctions which give rise to local dialects. And

each member of a community individually assumes from time to time different standards in his own speech, dependent upon the demands of varying purpose and circumstance. These different planes of speech are all English, but not the same kinds of English. The most apparent difference of kind is that between spoken and written English, each of which has its own peculiar laws and manners. Other groupings arise from an infinite variety of differing associations and ideas. The merchant meeting his fellow-merchant talks the merchant's dialect; the two instinctively feel themselves in the same group by the possession of common symbols of expression. If a politician enters into the conversation he will speak his dialect and immediately two groups will be established. The three can remain within one group only so long as they enlarge the circle of their speech to include only those ideas for which all three have a common vocabulary of expression. But the speech of the merchant in his character of merchant, of the politician, of the "educated" man, of the "uneducated," of the man of taste and of "good society," of the cosmopolitan man of the world, of the plain man of the streets, of every man within the round of his customary activities, will each have its own definite and distinguishing peculiarities. The merchant manifestly need not always speak as merchant; he may enter into various groupings, may speak the language of the man of taste or any other language. But each part as he assumes it will necessarily carry with it an appropriate set of speech habits. Instinctively we choose our groups, and instinctively we judge every man who addresses us by putting him into his group. A mere word, or an inflection in pronunciation will often suffice to lead us to a subjective synthesis of harmony or of discord. We draw the speaker into our group for the time being, or ruthlessly expel him from it; we grapple him to our souls with hooks of speech, or with the bitter instinctive hatred of tribal hostility, we push him beyond our circle of linguistic sympathy.

Such are, in brief, the ways in which standards of speech arise. They take their origin from the unconscious imitative tendencies of differing groups of people. Like other habits and customs, they are the necessary result of man's gregarious mode of life; they are the bonds of similarity by means of which each group interprets to

itself its own unity and homogeneity. In most instances the usages of standard speeches thus established by custom never raise the question of their values. They are assumed to be right because they are so, and supposedly always have been so. Long-continued habit prevents any skeptical attitude toward them by removing the necessity or occasion for skepticism. The question of values arises when one set of customary habits in speech demands attention by coming into conflict with another and differing set. Such a conflict of habits may occur as the result of a great variety of conditions. The members of two speech communities of wide geographical separation, each of which has its own distinctive habits, through conversation or through the printed page, may be brought into relation to each other. If the good will of each toward the other is sufficiently great, each side in the communication may so extend the area of negligible variation as to include the other within its circle of sympathetic unity. Or one or the other, as frequently happens, may be so unobservant of the habits and customs of others, so absolutely centered in its own habits and customs, as not to perceive those differences when they exist. This blind and comfortable state of mind always prevents any question of values from arising. But whenever a sensitive appreciation of the differences between two standards of speech is found, there also the question of the right or wrong of one or the other is bound to present itself. Whether the differences of standard are those due to geographical considerations, to social, professional, or educational, as soon as one instinctive speech habit, one of the symbols by aid of which the subjective synthesis of understanding is secured, is called in question by another, the result is always the pricking of the bubble of unity and homogeneity. The skeptical spirit enters and asks the speaker whether he has been really using the right symbol for the accomplishment of the complete and harmonious understanding which he supposed he had always been able to bring about. He is compelled for the moment to try to see himself as others see him, to discover if he has not been living in a fool's paradise of false certainties. Such questions once raised must be decided one way or the other, for only by deciding them can the speaker continue in the assumption of intelligibility and sympathy, without which effective communication is impossible.

From Horace and Quintilian down to the present day this question of the conflict of standards has been usually answered by the rule that custom is the only law of speech. Now custom is a term practically equivalent to standard. It means the accepted practice of a group of speakers whose habitual acts we are for the moment observing. And the second term of the definition obviously means the same thing. No one supposes that a law of speech has any external or autocratic authority. Linguistic laws are merely the generalizations derived by the observation of customary practice; they are the groupings of similars caused by the common human habit of imitation. The Horatian maxim therefore really begs the question in that it merely says that the standard of the speech is the law of the speech. Now it cannot be supposed that there is only one standard for a speech. On the contrary, it has been shown above that in every speech there are many standards. The real question of values consists in determining which standard under a given set of circumstances is the one to apply, and in the case of the conflict of two standards, which is to be accepted as good.

The endeavor to discover appropriate standards in speech is very similar to the task of the judge in pronouncing the law. The judge does not make the law; he has no authority to do so. His task consists in discovering the law, which itself arises from that custom or practice of the people with respect to a certain kind of action, which satisfies the sense of justice. Any arbitrary decision which transgresses the common sense of justice can maintain itself only temporarily by the power of authority, and must in time yield to the common-sense demand that the law shall not impose a judge's sense of right upon the people except when that sense of right is well founded in general human experience. Law becomes thus customary and standard practice, and is recognized as law only after the practice itself is well on the way to becoming established. In fact law, like standards in speech, becomes a matter for special attention only when there is a conflict of laws, a litigation. And again like speech, thousands of habitual human actions never become matters of law because they fall within the broad regions of negligible variation. Law, in the formal sense, consists of that whole body of custom which has been stated in definite terms as result of trial and examination.

Yet all instances of difference of opinion as to rights that may arise in the relations of men to each other are not included within the body of formulated law. The important responsibility of the judge is to find the law in each specific instance, whether it is expressed by precedent or whether it can be arrived at only by the combination of different principles hitherto not brought to bear upon the situation.

The task of scholarship in both the judge of law and the critic of speech is to place each individual instance as it comes into question in its proper place, to find the justice of its situation as the sense of justice is determined, not by the theory of the judge or the critic, but by the sound and long-continued customary practice of men. When Horace says that custom is the law of speech, he says nothing more than what everyone instinctively believes and practices, and what everyone wishes to practice when the matter becomes conscious and didactic. The difficulties consist in finding the true custom, not in imposing it upon the speech.

Whenever it becomes necessary to determine the values of standards it is apparent that a choice must be made between two or more standards. The mere descriptive statement of a custom in speech does not automatically carry with it the solution of the problems of right and wrong in speech. After the standards have been determined, there still remains the task of choosing from the standards just the one which satisfies the sense of justice for each separate instance. The choice is not always easy or simple. It depends frequently upon the observation of details which do not lie on the surface, but which are perceived only by one who has acquired skill and experience in the analysis of the activities of language relations. A broad theoretical solution of the difficulties is of little practical help. One may say that the best custom in speech is a national custom. But all speech and writing are not national in their appeal. If they were we should be limited to what would soon come to seem a very formal and flavorless expression. All we can say is that the best national custom in speech is the one that is national. When one wishes to be intimate and personal, a generalized national speech cannot help him far along his way. The defense may be made that in advocating a national speech, the speech of the greatest number, as a standard for all, we shall keep, at any rate, on

safe ground, that national usage is never bad usage. But this is a way of disposing of difficulties merely by evading them. If one will limit his speech to those things which the national speech is capable of expressing, he will never need any other than the national standard. Unfortunately, however, men must be individuals before they can become members of states.

Another absolute standard often proposed is the authority of good writers. In essence this theory implies that good writers present a kind of code of all the possible customary practices of the language. Whenever any question of practice is to be decided, all we need do is to go to the body of good literature and search it diligently. Imbedded in it some place, one will find the custom or practice which he may apply then as governing the special instances.

Now it is manifestly possible to define good use in such a way as to include only those forms of language which have had the good fortune to receive their credentials, so to speak, by being taken into the favor of some good writer. Other forms of speech which have not been thus ennobled may do very well in their way, but they cannot enter the inner circle of good use until they receive the stamp of literary approval. We may group them under the head of probationary use, if we will, but may not accept them unreservedly until we have sanction for so doing. But the arbitrariness and narrowness of such a theory of good use immediately secures its rejection. A more reasonable defense of the authority of good writers may be made on the ground that their writings are not a dogmatic, standardizing authority, but that they embody in themselves a code of use which is merely formulated practice, like the codified bodies of civil laws. It is hardly necessary to attempt to discuss here who "good writers" are, or just what are their chronological and other limitations. On such points, two opinions will never agree. Nor need we pause to show that good writers offer a body of usages almost as extensive and varied as those of spoken language, in the complexities of which it is quite as easy to lose oneself, nor that if a good writer is a dogmatic authority in favor of a good use, he is just as strong an authority in favor of the instances of bad use which are bound to occur in his pages. It is more to the purpose to call attention to the fact that all communication is not written and literary,

and that a literary standard, like the national standard, has value only when it is appropriate to the purpose in view. The authority of good writers is powerful when it comes to the question of determining the historical practice of good writing; under other circumstances it carries no weight at all, unless indeed one assumes the ideal attitude that it is the whole duty of every man to become a good writer and to rule his life accordingly. Even so it might be questioned whether the following of literary models would be the best means of attaining the end.

Whatever absolute standard we may attempt to establish, whether it be the standard of education, of literature, of "good society," of official society, of the "upper class" in general, we shall find that in the end our standard can only be partial. The actual practice of language shows that the values of standards are always relative, that a custom is good only so long as it fits the circumstances in which it has developed. Theoretically and ideally we may wish that one set of customs, the one naturally of which we approve, should replace another, and we may even strive to bring this about. In that case, however, we are not really changing custom, but changing the constitution of the groups of people by whom customs are made. It becomes apparent that each custom in speech, having arisen in answer to the needs of speech, is good for its own purpose. One good and effective custom cannot be transferred to another group of activities and remain equally effective. The values of speech habits are immediate and practical. The merchant talking to the merchant may meet all the requirements of the situation and may thus realize everything that speech under the circumstances can do. His language may be a complete economic adjustment of means to an end, and more than this we cannot ask of any man's language. If the merchant falls into conversation with the man of taste he may lay himself open on various sides to scorn and criticism; but his failure to maintain his own is not due to the fact that his customs of speech are intrinsically wrong or bad, but that the economic adjustment between the two is imperfect—as though a trotting and a galloping horse were being driven together.

However desirable it might seem from the point of view of theory to have such a rule, there is consequently no one rule for determining

the values of standards of speech. This question of values is indeed the question of values throughout the whole art of speech. The colors of words, their powers of suggestion, their associations, their history, origin, etymology, all these enter into the determination of the worth of the elements of language. Obviously not all persons are affected in the same way by the different aspects of language. A sensitive ear pays more heed to mere sound and the groupings of sounds than an insensitive one. A widely read speaker or writer with a good memory cannot help hearing and using words with a broad penumbra of literary associations. The historical student, on the other hand, sees words through a still wider perspective. The literal contemporary meaning of words is often qualified in his mind by the historical changes which have preceded the contemporary meaning. Who would dream of trying to fit definite standards of speech to different temperaments, or to the changing moods of daily life? We are always striving to strike the responsive chord, to bring about the subjective synthesis of sympathy and understanding. But we know that this cannot be done by any rule of thumb. It is a delicate and difficult matter, and no one, not even the most successful, always succeeds in it. And in this very difficulty lies the whole problem of getting at the heart and life of language. It may comfort some philosophers to think of a system of human ideas and emotions each of which has its final assigned place and value in the scheme of things, and which therefore may have its definite and completely adequate expression in language. An algebra of language would be quite possible with such a system. But this experiment has been tried often enough by the advocates of a universal philosophical language, and happily has been found wanting. Much of the fascination and the joy in the use of language lies in the fact that it is elusive and uncertain in its values. To be able always to say precisely what we meant and to be sure also that what we said would always be understood precisely as it should be, would make this indeed a dull world. Better occasional misunderstanding, with the play of energy and imagination necessary to prevent misunderstanding, than a smooth level of absolute certainty.

One final question of a less practical kind than the foregoing discussion of values in the habits of speech presents itself. Grant-

ing all the present diversity of standards in speaking and writing, and granting also the impossibility of dogmatic statement of the values of any custom other than that its value is dependent upon its usefulness, there still remains the question of individual attitude toward standard. For after all, standards and customs must be maintained, since it is only by the possession of symbols of homogeneous and unified expression that language is able to attain its end of communication. And moreover customs in speech are merely an index to those necessary general social customs of all kinds which make up the sum of conduct of each respective personality. But what homogeneity shall each personality set up for itself? Are there any general ideals that can be said to have any prescriptive significance? Should we strive to further consciously a national type of conduct, an educational, or the cosmopolitan one of polished society?

These questions are too difficult to answer. Every reflecting man will of necessity consider such matters from time to time, but his decisions will be very little dependent upon what someone else tells him he ought to do. The morals of language are as incapable of universal statement as the morals of other social habits. At the one extreme, we find those who feel no need at all of rules of conduct in language. "We artists," says Lamartine to Victor Hugo, "do not need to know language according to principles. We must speak as the word comes to our lips." At the other extreme stands the grammarian and rhetorician, who can give you a rule for every dot and every letter, and who is sadly given to anathematizing if you fail to follow his rules. Each practitioner in the art of language must find his own place within these two extreme limits. The speaker or writer who feels the need of the moral support of the rhetorical straight-jacket, who would rather believe a dictionary than his own judgment, may be following the best and quickest way to personal independence and certainty in his command over language. His danger is that a cold and commonplace legality may come to seem the only ideal worth striving for. On the other hand, the speaker or writer who follows mere instinct, who speaks as the words come to his lips, may be on the road to slovenliness or to eccentricity and excessive individuality in language. Therefore a

safety device of some kind is necessary for all, and we may find this in academic authority, if we are willing to submit to that kind of authority, or, if not, we must find it in the no less certain compulsion of social responsibility. Innovation and differentiation there must be, always tending toward the breaking-down of established customs and standards, and perhaps for the welfare of the speech and certainly for the heightening of its interest, the ideal attitude may be stated as that which shall lead to the highest degree of differentiation compatible with sympathetic communication. Beyond this limit lies anarchy, and on the hither side, the tendency toward the formal, undiscriminated, general, and conventional. But the maximum of individuality compatible with effective communication is a safe if broad rule. It is difficult of successful application only because it calls for several exceptional virtues in both those who hear or read and those who speak or write. In the former it calls for charity and openness of mind, and in the latter for sensitiveness in observation and discreet judgment in practice. The rule is not a magic formula opening the doors of success in expression, but its practical value is perhaps for that reason the greater. For it is the universal testimony of the masters in the art of language that excellence in the practice of that art is not easily attained, and that one man's rule is likely to prove another man's undoing.

GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK CITY

SPRACHWISSENSCHAFTLICHE AUSBLICKE

Wenn hier der versuch gewagt wird, in kurzen worten bericht zu geben über einen komplex von ideen, die sich über ein weites gebiet verzweigen und doch in einem brennpunkte zusammentreffen; wenn in diesen grossen zusammenhängen sichere erkenntnisse mit dunkel vorausgeschautem, vielleicht teilweise falschem wechseln; wenn da und dort die knappste andeutung an stelle von schrittweiser, klarer ausführung geboten wird: so ist sich der verfasser der zweifelhaften wissenschaftlichen methode, die in einem solchen unterfangen liegt, wohl genug bewusst. Die vorliegende arbeit—wenn sie den namen einer arbeit verdient—ist nichts weiter als ein atemholen auf einem noch kaum begonnenen wege; ein rückblick auf die geringe verrichtete arbeit; ein ausblick auf das unendlich viele, was noch zu tun ist. Dass ich trotzdem diesen rohen entwurf meinen fachgenossen unterbreite, sie um kritik und mitarbeit bittend, das liegt an der festen überzeugung, dass in den grundzügen hier wirklich wichtige anregungen zu neuem wissenschaftlichen schaffen gegeben sind—anregungen, deren widerlegung oder bejahung von gleicher wichtigkeit ist, und zugleich an der erkenntnis, dass eine einzige menschenkraft zur ausbeutung dieser wissensminen kläglich unzureichend ist. Für form und methode bittet der verfasser also um nachsicht; für unrichtiges um kritik; für alles wertvoll scheinende aber und alles nur in keimen angedeutete um mitarbeit.

Die punkte, um die es sich vor allem handelt, und die im folgenden nur zum teil näher besprochen werden, sind: die zusammenfassung aller rein germanischen lautveränderungen unter eine einheitliche phonetische tendenz—für konsonanten wie für vokale; die rückanwendung dieser einen tendenz auf probleme der indogermanischen ursprache, wie die frage der tenuis aspirata, gewisser personalendungen des verbs und des ablauts; eine interpretation der lautgesetze als zeitweiliger etappen im zuge der phonetischen tendenzen; die psychologische interpretation der germanischen grundtendenz der sprachentwicklung und die anwendung dieser auslegung

auf die germanische tempusentwicklung, den umlaut, die wortstellung, das verhältnis zwischen metrik und inhalt und vieles andere. Während diese aufzählung in ihrer reichhaltigkeit und vielseitigkeit fast an komik grenzen mag, ist sich der verfasser bewusst, nur einige der typischsten, charakteristischsten marksteine des grossen gebietes im fluge zu berühren. Ihm steht es klar vor augen, dass die sprachwissenschaft nicht ein konglomerat von einzelheiten, sondern ein fest geschlossener geisteskomplex ist, der weit über den namen der wissenschaft hinausreicht. Denn nichts gibt es in der gesamten geisteswelt—nicht literatur, nicht musik oder bildende kunst, nicht äussere oder innere geschichte—was ein so wahres bild von der geistigen beschaffenheit des volkes gäbe wie die sprache, recht verstanden und ausgelegt. Denn nichts anderes geht entfernt in gleichem masse aus der gesamtpsychie des volkes hervor. Ich erinnere hier gern an die nicht allseits günstig aufgenommene und doch in ihrem weitblick wahrhaft grosse schrift von Nikolaus Fink, *Der deutsche Sprachbau*, die in prachtvoll klarer und kenntnisreicher, wenn auch nur andeutender weise den einklang zwischen deutscher seele und deutschem sprachbau verfolgt.

1. Das vornehmste ergebnis der sprachforschung des letzten jahrhunderts war die erkenntnis, dass die sprache sich *gesetzmässig entwickelt*, eine erkenntnis, die August Leskien im Jahre 1876 unter der formel der ausnahmslosigkeit der lautgesetze niederlegte; seine tat war in ihrer schlichtheit und klarheit bestimmend für mehr als eine generation von sprachforschern. Die glänzende reihe, an deren anfang er steht—die Brugmann'sche generation mag man sie nennen—hat vor allem das verdienst der feineren organisation, vertiefung und ausbreitung dieses gedankens der gesetzmässigkeit. Sie hat namentlich auf lautkundlichem gebiet material gesammelt, das für den praktischen gebrauch insofern wenigstens als vorläufig ausreichend gelten konnte, dass sich auf seiner grundlage neben Brugmann-Delbrücks grundriss die Hirt-Streitberg'sche sammlung von grammatiken ins leben rufen liess, die einen einstweiligen überblick über den stand der sprachwissenschaft mit einem minimum von zeitaufwand gestattet, ohne dabei an selbständigkeit der forschung einzubüssen.

2. Es ist ein grosses verdienst dieser schule, sich *ex professo* vom schriftbilde, nach Sievers'scher forderung, abgewandt und den *laut*, nicht den buchstaben *als träger der sprache* anerkannt zu haben. Die reiche ernte phonetischer erkenntnisse von Sievers bis Bremer ist die frucht. Einzelne ansätze, die neuen physiologischen funde in der untersuchung der historischen entwicklung der sprache zu verwenden, finden sich verstreut an vielen orten: in Sievers' phonetik und sprachmelodik, in der einleitung ziemlich jeder neuen sprachwissenschaftlichen grammatik und ganz besonders bei gelegentlichen diskussionen des prinzipis der ausnahmslosigkeit der lautgesetze (zb. Bremer in der einleitung zur *Deutschen Phonetik*; Herzog in den *Streitfragen der romanischen Philologie*, usw.). Und doch kann man sich der erkenntnis nicht verschliessen, dass zwischen der auffassung der lautgesetze als solcher und der physiologischen analyse der einzellaute noch beträchtliche fremdheit besteht—selbst da, wo phonetische erkenntnis und sprachhistorisches forschen in so glänzender weise vereinigt sind wie bei Eduard Sievers. In der auffassung des einzelnen lautes ist unser denken und fühlen schon mehr oder weniger bewusst physiologisch. Aber unsere auffassung des lautgesetzes, des überganges von einem laut zum andern ist trotz alledem und alledem noch recht stark im banne des buchstabens, des konkreten beispils, und noch recht weit von einem physiologischen allgemeinempfinden entfernt.

3. *Lautgesetze* sind formulierungen periodischer ergebnisse von lautveränderungen. Wenn wir sagen, dass idg. *p* zu germ. *f* wurde, so übergehen wir mit stillschweigen eine reihe von zwischenstufen: aspirierte tenuis, bilabiale affricata, bilabiale spirans seien nur als springende punkte erwähnt. Wir betrachten das lautgesetz dieser veränderung als abgeschlossen, wenn wir an dem in der literatursprache graphisch darstellbaren resultat des labiodentalen *f* angelangt sind. Das kann für das leben der sprache einen wirklichen markstein bedeuten, wenn die entwicklung des betreffenden lautes damit zu einem stillstand gekommen ist, wie eben beim *f*. Dagegen haben wir beispielsweise bei der entwicklung von idg. *dh* > germ. *d* > westgerm. *d* > hochdeutsch *t* zwar mehrere sprachhistorisch nachweisbare einzellaute, doch ist jeder derselben—wohl auch der letzte—nur eine vorläufige etappe in einem fortdauernden zug der

entwicklung. Die einzelnen lautgesetze, mit denen wir jede stufe bezeichnen, sind stundenschläge—die uhr ist zwischen den stundenschlägen nie stillgestanden. Die stundenschläge sind auf dem gebiete der indogermanischen sprachen mit leidlicher vollständigkeit beobachtet und registriert worden; aber wir haben noch kaum einen blick in das rädergetriebe geworfen—auf die einheitliche fort-dauer von strömungen, welche lautliche veränderungen gleicher oder ähnlicher art hervorrufen.

4. Vielfach finden wir *reihen* von lautveränderungen, die uns zu systematischer gruppierung zwingen, da sich viele laute gemeinsam nach einheitlichen grundsätzen verändern. Die hervorstechendsten beispiele solchen gruppenweisen lautwandels sind die germanische lautverschiebung, die ungermanische palatalisierung (vgl. den artikel des verfassers in einer der nächsten nummern der *IF*, "Die Stabilität des germanischen Konsonantensystems," sowie *AJP*, XXXIII, 195 ff., "Phonetic Tendencies in the Indo-European Consonant System"), der ablaut (sofern der ausdruck "lautwandel" auf ihn passt) und der umlaut. Natürlich hat es nicht an versuchen gefehlt, für solchen reihenwandel, namentlich für die lautverschiebung, einheitliche erklärungen zu finden, doch liegt die schwäche fast aller darin, dass sie immerhin relativ isolierte erscheinungen, wie einerseits die germanische lautverschiebung für sich, die hochdeutsche lautverschiebung für sich, Verners gesetz für sich usw., behandeln, mit einem worte, dass sie erklärungen für ein lautgesetz oder eine kleinere gruppe von lautgesetzen, nicht aber für die *gesamte lautliche entwicklung einer sprache* zu geben beabsichtigen.

5. Die letztere absicht, wenn auch dort noch nicht klar ausgesprochen, liegt meinen beiden aufsätzen "Forchhammers Akzenttheorie und die germanische Lautverschiebung," *JEGP*, XI, 1 ff. und "Die zweite Lautverschiebung und die Völkerwanderung" (noch nicht veröffentlicht, jedoch ende 1912 vor der Central Division der Modern Language Association vorgelesen) zugrunde. Sie stellen die tatsache fest, dass sämtliche lautverschiebungserscheinungen im weitesten sinne des wortes (also auch Verners gesetz, Holtzmanns gesetz, Sievers' gesetz und die germanische tenuisgeminierung) auf einer *gemeinsamen physiologischen grundlage* beruhen: auf einem stetigen entgegenwirken von intensivem atemdruck und intensiver

muskelspannung der sprachorgane. Als gegenteil stellt sich in den nicht-germanischen sprachen, bald mehr, bald weniger, geringer atemdruck oder geringe muskelspannung dar, die zum fehlen von aspiration, zu leichter assimilation und ganz besonders zu palatalisierung (assimilation an vordervokale mit gleichzeitiger depression der mittellinie der zunge: rillenbildung) führen. Für das letztere liefert mein obenerwähnter aufsatz über die stabilität des germanischen konsonantensystems das belegmaterial. Dort wird gezeigt, dass die ausbreitung der palatalisierung innerhalb der indogermanischen sprachen sich in form konzentrischer gürtel um das germanische sprachgebiet darstellen lässt, indem diese lautveränderungen umso früher und umso allgemeiner auftreten, je früher sich das betreffende volk von dem germanischen zentrum entfernt hat, bzw. je weiter es von demselben entfernt ist. Ebenso ist nicht der geringste zweifel, dass die assimilation von konsonanten an vokale, die gleichfalls eine folge geringen drucks und gegendrucks ist, in den germanischen sprachen in geringerem masse auftritt als in jeder andren indogermanischen sprachgruppe; doch ist der detaillierte beweis dafür noch zu erbringen.

6. Innerhalb des germanischen sind, wie die angeführten artikel nachweisen, geradezu *alle konsonantenveränderungen* mit ausnahme der assimilationen, also alle fälle unbedingten lautwandels, sowie die lediglich vom akzent abhängigen lautveränderungen im konsonantismus, lediglich jenem *druck- oder intensitätsprinzip* zuzuschreiben. Die liquide und nasale sind ja so gut wie unveränderlich—einige einzelheiten sind bei andrer gelegenheit zu behandeln—die halbvokale aber ändern sich genau nach den normen, die im einklang mit diesem grundsatz in meinem aufsatz über die germanische lautverschiebung festgestellt sind; s.u., § 7. Unter "germanisch" ist hier natürlich wie in all den erwähnten artikeln das germanische sprachgebiet ohne fremdsprachliche beimischung zu verstehen. Beträchtliche fremdsprachliche, also *fremdvolkliche einflüsse* treten den germanischen sprachtendenzen hindernd in den weg, wofür die zweite lautverschiebung ein klassisches beispiel gibt; in dem oben erwähnten vortrage wird nämlich dargelegt, dass wir die phonetischen zwischenstufen zwischen der sogenannten ersten und der sogenannten zweiten lautverschiebung gewissermassen in

versteinerungen in den deutschen dialekten vom althochdeutschen herauf aufbewahrt finden. Die chronologische aufeinanderfolge der lautverschiebungsakte hat sich in der weise in geographische lagerung umgesetzt, dass bei der fächerförmig vom ostelbischen zentrum zuerst nach nordwest- dann nach mittel- und zuletzt nach süd-deutschland sich ausbreitenden auswanderung jeder germanische stamm die germanische sprache in dem zustand mit sich nahm, in dem sie sich eben zur zeit seiner auswanderung in der alten heimat befand. In jedem streifen der neuen heimat nun, vom anglofriesischen bis zum bairischen, hörte bald nach der berührung der germanischen einwanderer mit der alten keltischen bevölkerung die sprachentwicklung im sinne der germanischen lauttendenzen auf, und so finden wir mit ziemlicher treue die auf einander folgenden stufen der lautverschiebung geographisch festgebannt. Mehr noch: wo die nichtgermanische beimischung besonders stark war, wie auf alemannischem und bairischem boden, treten gewisse erscheinungen zurück oder werden differenziert, wie zb. die stimmlose lenis *b, d, g* für die fortis *p, t, k* im oberdeutschen eintritt und sich auf dem ganzen hochdeutschen gebiet der sibilant *ts, s* statt der spiranten *th*, einstellt. Die zweite lautverschiebung bei den langobarden und krimgoten ist, wie die betreffende arbeit auseinandersetzt, eine stütze dieser auffassung.

7. Wenn ein so einheitlicher zug den ganzen germanischen konsonantismus beherrscht, drängt sich die frage auf, wie sich die veränderungen der vokale dazu stellen. Da hier anregungen, nicht detaillierte nachweise gegeben werden sollen, sei nur in knappsten umrissen dargelegt, wie das gleiche intensitätsprinzip auch hier zur geltung kommt. Druckverstärkung führte bei halbvokalen zu weiterer zungenhebung, so dass sie zu spiranten und endlich zu verschlusslauten wurden: *j* zu got. *ddj*, nord. *ggi*, *w* zu *ggw* (Holtzmanns gesetz); druckschwächung führte, infolge von zungensenkung, spiranten in halbvokale über: *gw* wurde zu *w* (Sievers' gesetz). Unser heutiges deutsch lehrt uns, dass bei germanischen sprachtendenzen nachdruck—also druckverstärkung—einen vokal dehnt: vom proklitischen 'n schreiten wir über *dān*, *den*, bis zu emphatischem und darum gedehntem *de:n* vor (während die skala *an-en-e:n* gleichzeitig eine immer höhere zungenstellung aufweist). So können wir

es leicht genug verstehen, dass die intensivere artikulation eines *ā* es in *ō*, *uo*, *ū* überführt, während kurzes *o*, mit schlafferer artikulation, zu kurzem *a* wird. Dass im slavischen genau das entgegengesetzte eintritt, ist sehr kennzeichnend für eine sprachgruppe, die auch so stark zur palatalisierung neigt. Die einzelheiten dieser übergänge sind einer arbeit der nächsten zukunft vorbehalten. Keiner der auf den ersten blick sich ergebenden widersprüche ist unlösbar. Vielmehr steht es für mich fest, dass auch alle vokalveränderungen ebenso wie aller konsonantenwandel im germanischen dem intensitätsprinzip entspringen.

8. Wenn wir nun diese tendenz durch das ganze germanische sprachleben (nebenbei bemerkt: bis zur gegenwart) verfolgen können, lässt sich dann nicht auch ein *zurückverfolgen in die vorgermanische zeit* denken? An der hand der siedlungsverhältnisse, verglichen mit den örtlichen ergebnissen der zweiten lautverschiebung, vermögen wir der germanischen konsonantenentwicklung durch vielleicht tausend jahre schritt für schritt zu folgen. Nun sind doch ähnliche wanderungen indogermanischer völker vorausgegangen. Wenn wir vorläufig die hypothese annehmen, die gegenwärtig die meisten anhänger zu haben scheint, dass nämlich die indogermanischen wanderungen, vom mittlern nordeuropa ausgehend, sich zunächst nach südosten, dann nach süden und endlich nach westen richteten, dann ergibt sich ein arbeitsfeld von überraschender reichhaltigkeit. Von den zahlreichen neuen ausblicken auf diesem gebiete sei nur wenig als besonders charakteristisch erwähnt.

9. Bei der zweiten lautverschiebung sehen wir, dass die *tenuis*, und unter diesen die *dentale*, sich zuerst verändern; am stärksten ist die neigung zur verschiebung anscheinend in nicht anlautender stellung. Gewiss ging der verschiebung zur *spirans* eine immer stärker werdende aspiration und dann eine affrizierung voraus, wie das beispiel des heutigen dänischen zeigt. Nun finden wir im indogermanischen ein merkwürdiges nebeneinander von *tenuis* und *tenuis aspirata*, das bei den dentalen am häufigsten und sichersten vorkommt. Doch ist bloss im indischen und im griechischen dieses nebeneinander von *t* und *th* klar ersichtlich—zwei indogermanischen sprachen, die völkern angehören, bei denen der rassengegensatz in der form sozialer gliederung sich besonders lange erhielt. Es liegt

nahe, zu folgender interpretation zu greifen: zur zeit, als das germanische sich als volkseinheit von den andren, vielleicht zum teil schon auswandernden indogermanen loslöste, war die lautverschiebung schon im gange; die nicht-germanischen indogermanen behielten sie vorläufig in der form bei, in der sie damals bestand, nämlich als aspirierung von *tenuis* unter mehr oder minder bestimmten bedingungen; nur in den beiden genannten sprachstämmen aber drang dies in die literatursprache ein; in den anderen nicht-germanischen sprachen fiel der unterschied zwischen den beiden arten der *tenuis* ebenso wieder weg wie etwa im oberdeutschen der unterschied zwischen *k* und *kch*, während im germanischen (und teilweise im keltischen) ein zusammenfall nach anderer richtung eintrat: die verschiebung ging nicht zurück, sondern ergriff alle *tenuis*. Auch hier ist der nähere nachweis (für den ich indessen aus dem indischen und griechischen vollständiges material gesammelt habe) noch zu erbringen. Doch ist wenigstens ein punkt auch hier von interesse, da er auf den begriff der ausnahmslosigkeit von lautgesetzen, ohne ihn in der tat im mindesten zu erschüttern, ein besonderes licht wirft: *th* neben *t* zeigt sich nämlich ganz besonders in gewissen personalendungen des verbs und in gewissen demonstrativstämmen—also in fällen, wo kontrastbetonung zu erwarten ist; aus der fülle des vorkommenden sei nur darauf hingewiesen, dass für die zweite person des plurals die absolute, also stärker betonte endung *-the*, die konjunkte, also schwächer betonte dagegen *-te* ist; dass ferner der demonstrativstamm *to-*, der in dieser form lediglich korrelative bedeutung hat, in der form *tho-* deiktische bedeutung annimmt (ai. *itthā*, hier u.a.). Das macht den eindruck—mehr als das ist es vorläufig nicht, obwohl ein grosser teil des indischen materials nach der richtung zu deuten scheint—als ob bei starkem nachdruck die verschiebung früher erfolgt sei als sonst, sodass wir es vielleicht anerkennen mögen, dass unbeschadet der lautgesetze bei emphatisch (vielleicht auch bei besonders häufig?) gebrauchten formen oder wörtern lautverschiebungen der germanischen art besonders früh und oft zu erwarten sind. Dass aus dieser erwägung möglicherweise sogar ein licht auf die herkunft der personalendungen geworfen werden könnte, davon in einer andren arbeit. Ob auch das nebeneinander von *media* und *media aspirata* eine ähnliche

erklärung finden kann, scheint mir zweifelhaft, unmöglich aber nicht.

10. So ergibt sich für das indogermanische zum mindesten die starke möglichkeit, dass sein konsonantensystem zur zeit der trennung schon in einer verschiebung begriffen war und es fragt sich, ob das vokalsystem ähnliches aufweise. Da bietet sich als selbstverständliche folge einer nachdrucksbetonung der *quantitative ablaut*, der sich ja in nichts von dem unterscheidet, was das heutige deutsch bei wörtern, die starken akzentunterschieden ausgesetzt sind, wie dem artikel, aufweist. Ob aber nicht auch in den *flexionsendungen des verbs*, die so starken dynamischen ablauterscheinungen ausgesetzt sind (*sai-si-s* usw.), schon eine vorstufe zu der germanischen entwicklung von *o* zu *a* zu finden ist? Der sonst im idg. seltene vokal *a* tritt mit merkwürdiger häufigkeit in formen auf, wo nach sonstigen analogien eher *o* zu erwarten wäre (in der ersten und zweiten person des perfekts, den medialendungen und vielleicht auch anderen formen). Auch hier liegen neue aufgaben.

11. Wie aber mit den *qualitativen ablaut*? Dass der *e*-, *o*- ablaut, um den es sich vorwiegend handelt, unterschiede in der tonhöhe darstellt, ist lange anerkannt; diese erkenntnis ist ja fast die einzige stütze der theorie von der teilweise musikalischen betonung des indogermanischen. Dass *e* "höher" ist als *o*, bedeutet vorerst, dass es einen höheren eigenton, also geringeren resonanzraum hat als *o*, was an sich mit musikalischer betonung nichts zu schaffen hätte. Es ist aber zuzugeben, dass tatsächlich ein enger zusammenhang zwischen höherem eigenton und höherem stimmton besteht, indem wir geneigt sind, zur hervorbringung eines hohen stimmtons auch einen vokal mit hohem eigenton (also *i* oder *e*), für tiefen stimmton dagegen einen "tiefen" vokal (*u* oder *o*) zu verwenden, und umgekehrt, indem wir *i* mit höherem stimmton auszusprechen geneigt sind als *u*; das kleine kindersprüchlein von den achtzehn kleinen gesellen (den konsonanten) und den fünf dolmetschern (den vokalen) ist dafür sehr bezeichnend. Hoher stimmton bedeutet aber anspannung der stimmbänder, also muskeldruck. Wie nun, wenn die *e*-formen lediglich formen grösserer spannung, lebhafteren interesses und darum stärkeren nachdruckes wären? Ich möchte geneigt sein, diese art des nachdruckes die subjektive, auf den sprechenden

konzentrierte zu nennen, dagegen die quantitative art, also die dehnung, als die objektive zu bezeichnen, indem ihr ziel das verständnis seitens des angeredeten zu sein scheint. Bedenken wir, dass das hauptgebiet des *e*-ablautes die präsensformen des verbs sind, also formen, die direkte subjective beziehung zum gegenwärtigen handeln ausdrücken; dagegen der *o*-ablaut vorwiegend den erreichten zustand—sagen wir, die perfektidee—ausdrückt, also etwas, was nicht so direkt in der vorstellung des sprechenden liegt. Ich bin mir klar darüber, dass dies müssige spekulationen sind, solange darin nicht die experimentelle phonetik und psychologie ihr wort gesprochen; deren rüstzeug fehlt mir fast gänzlich, aber zu meiner freude hat eine unzweifelhafte autorität auf beiden gebieten mir unterstützung zugesagt, sodass mir die lösung dieser frage in greifbare nähe gerückt scheint.

12. Schon hier lässt sich ohne psychologische deutung nicht auskommen. Eine erklärung der ganzen tendenz aber, jenes mehrfach erwähnten intensitätsprinzips, ist nun gar überhaupt nur auf rein psychologischer grundlage denkbar. Und hier bin ich in der glücklichen lage, meine seit jahren vertretenen anschauungen nicht einzig und allein mit meinen mangelhaften psychologischen kenntnissen stützen zu müssen, sondern mich auf Nikolaus Fink berufen zu können, der, wenn auch nicht psycholog von fach, doch über psychologische schulung von grosser gründlichkeit verfügt. In seinem schon 1898 erschienen buche über den deutschen sprachbau, das mir leider erst vor einem oder zwei jahren bekannt wurde, kommt er für die deutsche satzkonstruktion zu demselben ergebnis, das ich in laienhafter weise schon seit langem für die indogermanische oder—was dasselbe ist—germanische sprachentwicklung überhaupt angenommen hatte. Ohne mich direkt an ihn anzulehnen, weiche ich doch nicht allzuweit von ihm ab, wenn ich den indogermanen und unter ihnen vor allem den germanen, als den einzigen relativ unvermischt gebliebenen, ausgesprochene subjektivität—also beherrschung der vorstellungen durch das ich-bewusstsein—zuschreibe, verbunden mit einem "umspannungsvermögen," das bei grosser intensität und dauer sowohl der gefühle wie der vorstellungen einen grossen komplex umfasst, ihn unter die vorherrschaft einer überwiegenden vorstellung oder eines überwiegenden gefühls stellend. Das heisst:

Alles wahrgenommene wird in intensivster weise auf das individuum bezogen; und *ein* element überwiegt stets im denken und sprechen des germanen über andre, ihm angegliederte.

13. Die intensität der reizbarkeit und die dauer von eindrücken erklären die besprochenen druck- und spannungsverhältnisse. Denn sie lassen uns verstehen, wie sich in der rede gipfel-punkte mit besondrer bestimmtheit hervorheben, die den ausgangspunkt zu solchen lautveränderungen wie lautverschiebung und ablaut bilden; die erscheinungen des lautwandels, die zunächst an besonders stark oder auch besonders schwach hervortretenden lauten stattfinden, werden allmählich verallgemeinert. Das aus diesen faktoren hervorgehende "umspannungsvermögen" aber bringt uns der erklärungs eines anderen gruppenweisen lautwandels näher, des *umlautes*, in dessen spätem auftreten nur auf den ersten blick etwas überraschendes liegt. Die grundzüge einer dringend gebotenen näheren untersuchung stelle ich mir etwa so vor: Die physiologische erklärungs des umlautes—palatalisierung durch vermittlung des zwischenstehenden konsonanten—die beispielsweise für das russische fraglos zutrifft, befriedigt für das germanische aus vielen gründen nicht. Die bisherige anschauung der psychologischen vorausnahme hat ohne zweifel einen richtigen kern, lässt sich aber doch erst mit hilfe jener umspannungsfähigkeit verstehen: Diese fordert solche eigenheiten der deutschen wortstellung, wie sie sich im nebensatze, in der endstellung des trennbaren verbalpräfixes, in den adverbial bestimmten attributen usw. zeigen; das hat Fink auseinander-gesetzt, wenn er auch nicht den ausdruck "umspannungsvermögen" gebraucht. Dieselbe denkart nun, die uns in dem satze "es hörte nach drei tagen endlich zu regnen auf" im worte "hörte" schon in akzent und tonhöhe auf das letzte wort des satzes bezug nehmen lässt—genau diese denkart hat es gefordert, dass in dem worte *tochterlîn* > *töchterlîn* das *i* der endsilbe schon einen einfluss auf die zungenstellung des vokals der stammsilbe hervorrief. Es sei ausdrücklich bemerkt dass ich in diese andeutende erklärungs die von Axel Kock nachgewiesene ältere umlautschicht des nordischen (*gestr*) nicht einbeziehe, sondern in dieser tatsächlich einen rein physiologischen vorgang sehe. Darauf einzugehen würde hier zu weit führen.

14. Die subjektivität des germanen muss natürlich auf jedem gebiete des geisteslebens—literatur, bildende kunst, musik, religion usw.—von einfluss sein, aber sie muss sich notwendigerweise auch in der sprache zeigen. Wichtige faktoren im verbalsystem und im satzbau hat Fink hervorgehoben, aber natürlich kann seine kurze behandlung bei weitem nicht vollständig sein. Ein typisches beispiel in der entwicklung des verbs sei hier flüchtig gestreift. Das indogermanische besitzt bekanntlich noch keine tempora, sondern drei (oder mehr) besondere verbalstämme, die nicht das subjektive element der zeit, sondern den objektiven faktor der dauernden oder der momentanen handlung und des erreichten zustandes bezeichnen; so ist es wenigstens in der hauptsache. Dass in den personalendungen schon im indogermanischen auch das subjektive element stark hervortritt, mag hier beiseite bleiben. Im germanischen findet nun aus mehreren gründen, unter denen die auslautgesetze eine grosse rolle spielen, eine starke verschmelzung von formen statt, und das endergebnis ist, dass die "aktionsarten" beträchtlich in den hintergrund getreten sind und jetzt die bezeichnungen der momentanen handlung und des erreichten zustandes gemeinsam die funktion der dem sprechenden ferner liegenden, also vergangenen zeit übernehmen. Das gefühl des subjektiven einwirkens auf die umgebung bewirkt aber dann eine derartige ausbreitung der bezeichnung von blossem besitz (ich habe das feld gekauft=als ein gekauftes), dass diese ausdrucksweise in die funktion einer neuen form für den erreichten zustand, ja zum teil für die vergangenheit überhaupt, eintritt. Einzeluntersuchungen über die bildung der zusammengesetzten zeiten sind trotz schöner vorarbeiten (zb. Paul) noch für alle germanischen dialekte von nöten.

Vielleicht zeigen diese andeutungen, wie vieles auf diesem gebiete zu erreichen—oder zu widerlegen—ist, nicht nur für den sprachforscher, sondern auch für den kulturhistoriker, den literaturhistoriker, den psychologen. Verhältnismässig einfach sind die aufgaben noch auf germanischem gebiete zu nennen, da wir hier nach allem anschein eine im wesentlichen geradlinige entwicklung im sinne einer allgemeinen tendenz vorfinden. Aber bei anderen sprachen und volksgruppen, wie den romanen, den slaven usw.

muss es sich doch um ein zusammentreffen von mehreren strömungen handeln, eine ablenkung der indogermanischen strömung durch vermengung mit urbevölkerung oder neuem, nicht-indogermanischem zuwachs. Da werden die probleme natürlich an schwierigkeit ins ungemessene steigen. Doch braucht man deswegen noch lange nicht die hände vor dem versuch in den schoss zu legen; lieber das schöne motto eines deutschen verlags im auge behalten:

Arbeiten und nicht verzweifeln!

E. PROKOSCH

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

SPENSER AND THE PURITAN PROPAGANDA

The confusion that attends the use of the terms "Puritan" and "Puritanism" as applied to sixteenth-century England can best be appreciated through the analogous use of the words "socialist" and "socialism" today. The "standpatter" calls every effort at economic reform "socialistic," and the arch-conservative lavishes the title "socialist" upon professors of political science, social workers, municipal reformers, labor leaders, and utopians and anarchists of various stripes, with generous indiscrimination.

"Puritan" and "Puritanism" are employed with a corresponding looseness, and consequently such diverse personalities as Archbishop Grindal, Bishop Cox, the Earl of Leicester, Sir Philip Sidney, and Thomas Cartwright are all denominated Puritans, or credited with Puritan sympathies. Yet Grindal regarded Cartwright as a dangerous fellow who was poisoning the minds of the young men of Cambridge;¹ Bishop Cox did not hesitate to class the Puritans with the Papists as very anti-Christ;² and, to borrow a suggestion from Matthew Arnold, fancy the distress of Sidney or of Leicester if he had found himself confined for a three months to the "Mayflower," with only the Pilgrim Fathers for a solace! Like "socialism" today, "Puritanism" in the sixteenth century was a relative matter.

With the terms thus loosely used, it should be a matter of both critical and historical interest to determine the character and extent of the Puritanism of the great Elizabethan poet who is regarded as the sixteenth-century exponent of Puritanism in English letters and as the precursor of Milton.

Behind the varied, complex, and oftentimes incongruous manifestations of any notable movement in human affairs, behind its motley array of adherents, is the animating principle, the heart, of the movement, seldom fully understood at the time even by those who are its exponents. What was the essence, the determining impulse, of that movement in English religious life which we call Puritanism?

¹ Strype, *Life of Archbishop Grindal*, p. 240.

² *Zurich Letters*, I, 309, Parker Society.

The question has been variously answered by Roman Catholic, by High Churchman, by Low Churchman, by Dissenter, and it is hard even today for men to discuss it without prejudice or passion.

Puritanism was essentially a passionate belief in, and desire for, a direct and immediate communion between the soul and God, together with the conviction that man is by nature impure and unholy, and that the senses are, and must continue to be, at enmity with God's purposes. While the Catholic used the visible to approach the invisible, believing that only after a long series of approaches by such indirection, with the gradual sublimation of the senses, would man be prepared for direct perception of, and interblending with, the divine life; while the Catholic recognized that the "natural man" possessed some favor in God's sight because the good was therein mingled with evil, recognized that the natural conscience needed to be quickened and the natural will disciplined by the workings of God's spirit of grace; while the Catholic gratefully accepted the life of the senses as a part of God's gift to man, and tried to employ them to God's honor for the fuller realization of his own life and the more complete objectification of his partial perception of the divine; the Puritan believed that the elect had in a sense already arrived and might walk here and now with God; believed that unconverted man was odious in God's sight and that the soul that was not saved was lost; believed that the flesh was not given to help the soul, but was present as a dreadful menace until God should rescue his chosen ones therefrom.

These were the convictions that prompted and dictated the protestations of the Puritan. He protested against ceremonialism because he felt that it hindered rather than helped direct communion with God. Away with the altar that smacked of Roman idolatry! Away with cape and surplice and amice that ministered to the vanity of priests, increased reverence for sinful man, and obstructed the vision of God! Away with organs and canticles that soothed the sinful ear! Away with candles and deckings that pleased the sinful eye! Away with incense and flowers that captivated with sweet odor! Away with fair houses of worship, since the soul of a righteous man is the living temple of God!

Again, the Puritan protested against an ecclesiastical hierarchy, partly because he felt that it exalted man at the expense of God,

partly because he thought that it had no warrant in Scripture. Still again, the Puritan protested against tradition and reliance upon the Church Fathers, because he believed that the Scriptures offer the only sure revelation of God, and because therein God spoke directly and clearly to every man.

Behind all of these protestations was the congenial Calvinistic theology, which first attracted the Puritan type of mind and thereafter directed its bent.

It was but natural that the Puritan movement should influence men in varying degrees, and that one phase should appeal to one man, another to another. Thus Archbishop Parker, who is credited with having invented the derisive term of "Puritan,"¹ and who was constantly at war with those who objected to ecclesiastical vestments, nevertheless accepted the theological teachings of Calvin and responded enthusiastically to Calvin's proposal for a union of all Protestant bodies; Archbishop Grindal, who was with difficulty persuaded to accept the bishopric of London because of his scruples against ecclesiastical vestments, either *extra sacra* or *in sacris*,² was a staunch supporter of the episcopal hierarchy and of the union of Church and State; Bishop Jewel, who had like scruples against the habits, accepted the teachings of the Church Fathers of the first six centuries as absolute authority; and Bishop Cox, who excused himself from ministering to the Queen in her chapel because of the lights there,³ was zealous in upholding the discipline of the church, and urged the Archbishop of Canterbury to be circumspect and vigilant "that these godless schismaticks [the Puritans] overrun not the realm."⁴ The clergy aside, some men were attracted to Puritanism by its simple and austere regimen of life, some because it furnished a potent political tool, some because they could express thereby a sincere social protest, and still others—a great mob of violent and restless spirits, foul-mouthed revilers and anarchistic agitators, the Jacobinists of the sixteenth century—because they could express thereby their hatred of all law, order, and decency. This was the type of man who could characterize Archbishop Whitgift

¹ "Puritanism," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

² Strype, *Life of Grindal*, pp. 42-44.

³ Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, I, II, 260.

⁴ Strype, *Life of Archbishop Parker*, II, 193.

as "Beelzebub of Canterbury, the chief of the devils," an "ambitious wretch" sitting "upon his cogging stool which may truly be called the chair of pestilence."¹ Thus Puritanism attracted various men for various reasons, and in varying degrees. Indeed, there was no man holding an important position in the church who was free from Puritanism as we have interpreted its genius above, no man who, both in doctrine and in his conception of worship and of church organization, would have satisfied the High or moderate Churchman of today. The evangelical party was in the saddle.

Such being the character of Puritanism and such its varied appeal, what was Spenser's attitude toward it, first with respect to its outward propaganda, secondly with respect to its inner and essential spirit? The first of these questions will be considered in the present paper, leaving the more subtle and elusive question for later treatment.

When Spenser went up to Cambridge in 1569, he entered the very storm center of the agitation against the vestments, and his seven years of residence there were coincident with the most heated period of the struggle. No Cambridge student could have remained indifferent to the controversy. Indeed, at this very time did not the anti-vestiary party in Trinity College take advantage of the temporary absence of the master to preach against the habits and did not all but three of the members of the college appear at service without the surplice?²

From the very beginnings of the English Reformation, Cambridge had been the home of the evangelical party, and Pembroke Hall, which was Spenser's college, had been conspicuous from the third decade of the century as one of the colleges most devoted to religious and ecclesiastical reform.³ A master of Pembroke, Matthew Hutton, had been one of the five heads of colleges, who, in 1565, memorialized the chancellor, Cecil, against the Queen's proclamation for enjoining the habits, since "there was a multitude of pious and learned men, who thought in their consciences all using of such garments was unlawful to them."⁴ In vain did the Chancellor lament "this

¹ *Works of Archbishop Whitgift*, III, xviii, Parker Society.

² *Life of Archbishop Whitgift*, III, viii, Parker Society.

³ *Strype, Parker*, I, 12.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 386.

insolency of the youth"¹; in vain did the Archbishop pronounce that "Execution, execution, execution of laws and orders, must be the first and the last part of good government"²; in vain did the erudite scholar who sighed for academic peace complain of the *Fanatici Superpelliciani et Galeriani* who "made such disturbances by their counsels, that the time that before was wont to be taken up in the study of the arts and sciences was now spent and trifled away in fruitless disputations *de lana caprina*."³

In 1571 appeared the famous Puritan document *An Admonition to the Parliament*, which in twenty-three chapters attacked the whole constitution of the Church of England, both its organization and its ceremonials, as unscriptural and untenable. Four editions appeared in rapid succession and were so warmly received that reply was unavoidable. Consequently in 1572, at the instigation of Archbishop Parker, Whitgift replied with an *Answer to the Admonition*, and the battle was on. Cartwright, smarting under his recent expulsion from Cambridge, for which he had Whitgift to thank, quickly produced a *Reply to the Answer to the Admonition*. Whitgift in turn brought out a *Defense* of his *Answer* in 1574; to which Cartwright rejoined with a *Second Reply*, the first part of which was published in 1575, the second part in 1577. In these documents the gentle art of calling names was refined to the last degree of nicety. Imagine now the merry din at Cambridge, with the vice-Chancellor on the one hand and the expelled Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity on the other leading the respective forces in this holy war!

The principal contentions of the *Admonition* were that the ecclesiastical hierarchy should be replaced by a seignory and the ministers elected by the congregations, that the clergy be better educated, that more be made of preaching and less of the sacraments, and that vestments and other adornments be given up. In the words of the *Admonition*:

These and a great many other abuses are in the ministry remaining, which unless they be removed, and the truth brought in, not only God's justice shall be poured forth, but also God's church in this realm shall never be builded. For, if they which seem to be workmen are no workmen in deed, but in name, or else work not so diligently and in such order as the work-master commandeth, it is not only unlikely that the building shall go forward,

¹ Strype, Parker, I, 391.

² *Ibid.*, p. 389.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 393.

but altogether impossible that ever it shall be perfitted. The way therefore to avoid these inconveniences, and to reform these deformities, is this: Your wisdoms have to remove advowsons, patronages, impropriations, and bishops' authority, claiming to themselves thereby right to ordain ministers, and to bring in that old and true election which was accustomed to be made by the congregation. You must displace those ignorant and unable ministers already placed, and in their rooms appoint such as both can and will, by God's assistance, feed the flock. You must pluck down and utterly overthrow, without hope of restitution, the court of faculties. . . . Appoint to every congregation a learned and diligent preacher. Remove homilies, articles, injunctions, a prescript order of service made out of the mass-book. Take away the lordship, the loitering, the pomp, the idleness, and livings of bishops, but yet employ them to such ends as they were in the old church appointed for. Let a lawful and a godly seignory look that they preach, not quarterly or monthly, but continually; "not for filthy lucre sake, but of a ready mind." So God shall be glorified, your consciences discharged, and the flock of Christ (purchased with his own blood) edified.¹

In defense of preaching Cartwright wrote:

First, therefore, he asketh, and so that he doth most boldly and confidently affirm it, whether "the word of God is not as effectual when it is read as when it is preached"? or whether "reading be not preaching"? In which two questions, although the one of them confuteth the other, . . . yet I will answer to both. I say, therefore, that the word of God is not so effectual read as preached. For St. Paul saith that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing of the word preached"; so that the ordinary and especial means to work faith is by preaching, not by reading.²

And again, of the relative efficacy of preaching and sacraments:

And, whereas you say that it is manifest that our Saviour Christ was baptized without preaching, I would know of you what one word doth declare that, when on the contrary rather doth appear in St. Luke, which seemeth to note plainly that our Saviour Christ was baptized when the people were baptized. But the people, as I have shewed, were baptized immediately after they heard John preach; therefore it is like that our Saviour Christ was baptized after that he had heard John preach. And it is very probable that our Saviour Christ, which did honour the ministry of God by the hand of men so far as he would vouchsafe to be baptized of John, *would not neglect or pass by his ministry of the word, being more precious than that of the sacrament*; as it appeareth by John that our Saviour Christ was present at his sermons; forsomuch as St. John doth, as he was preaching to the people, point him out with the finger, and told them that he was in the midst of them which was greater than he.³

¹ *Whitgift*, III, 8, Parker Society.

² *Ibid.*, p. 30.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

To add to the intensity of feeling at Cambridge, in 1576, the year that Spenser proceeded M.A., Archbishop Grindal, a graduate of Pembroke College, sometime its master, its frequent benefactor,¹ and ever its idol,² fell into royal disfavor because of his expostulations with the Queen, who had ordered him to abridge the number of preachers and to put down the "prophecyings," conferences of ministers for the discussion of the Scriptures. As to preaching, the Archbishop argued that plentiful preaching was commanded by the Scriptures, that it was the means of salvation, that it bred loyalty to Her Majesty, "that whereas it was thought that the reading of the godly homilies might suffice, he acknowledged that the reading of the homilies had its commodity, but that it was nothing comparable to the office of preaching."³ As to the exercises he urged "that the ministers of the Church became more skillful and ready in the Scripture, that it withdrew them from idleness, and that some suspected in doctrine were brought to open confession of the truth."⁴ "As for that inconvenience that was urged by some, that one and the same place in Scripture hath diverse senses put upon it according to the various understanding of these exercises, this appeared worse than it was indeed, so that all senses were agreeable to the analogy of faith: for the ancient Fathers and Doctors of the Church did the same, and commonly expounded one text of Scripture diversely, yet all to the good of the Church."⁵ Elizabeth did not argue: she simply said that "it was good for the Church to have few preachers, and that three or four might suffice for a county, and that the reading of the homilies to the people was enough."⁶

With this controversial setting in mind, it must be evident to students of Spenser that the episode in *Mother Hubberds Tale*, ll. 342-574, in which the Fox and the Ape fall in with the priest and are induced to try his trade, are a satire in which Spenser voices the Puritan protest. He satirizes the ignorance and frivolity of the clergy and the Queen's distrust of preaching and prophecies, in the priest who could

Ne tell a written word, ne write a letter,
Ne make one title worse, ne make one better:

¹ Strype, *Grindal*, p. 462.

² See the letter sent by the College at Grindal's advancement to the see of Canterbury, *ibid.*, p. 461.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 330.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 331.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 329.

Of such deep learning little had he neede,
 Ne yet of Latine, ne of Greeke, that breede
 Doubts mongst Divines, and difference of texts,
 From whence arise diversitie of sects
 And hateful heresies of God abhor'd.
 But this good Sir did follow the plaine word,
 Ne medled with their controversies vaine;
 All his care was, his service well to saine,
 And to read Homelies upon holidayes;
 When that was done, he might attend his playes.¹

He satirizes the contention for the efficacy of the sacraments as opposed to preaching, and the sufficiency of the reading of the Scriptures, in the easy-going philosophy of the priest:

To feede mens soules (quoth he) is not in man;
 For they must feed themselves, doo what we can.
 We are but charg'd to lay the meate before:
 Eate they that list, we need to doo no more.
 But God it is that feedes them with his grace,
 The bread of life powr'd down from heavenly place.
 Therefore said he, that with the budding rod
 Did rule the Jewes, *All shalbe taught of God.*
 That same hath Jesus Christ now to him raught,
 By whom the flock is rightly fed, and taught:
 He is the Shepheard, and the Priest is hee;
 We but his shepheard swaines ordain'd to bee.

Nor do the vestments escape:

Ne to weare garments base of wollen twist,
 But with the finest silkes us to aray,
 That before God we may appeare more gay,

¹ The ignorance of some of the clerks who presented themselves for livings, as well as the summary treatment that they received from Archbishop Grindal, Spenser's ideal churchman, is illustrated by the following episode: "He [Grindal] shewed his faithfulness in his inspection over his Church, by taking what care he could that none but men of some ability and learning might be admitted to the cure of souls. And for this purpose he provided that such as came for institution to any living should be first well examined; and such as were found unlearned he rejected, notwithstanding their presentations. . . . One William Ireland was presented to the Rectory of Harthill; who coming to the Archbishop was examined by the Archbishop's Chaplain. In his presentation were these words, *vestri humiles et obedientes*; which the Chaplain required him to construe, to understand his ability in Latin. But he expounded them, *Your humbleness and obedience*. The Chaplain asked him again, Who brought up the people of Israel out of Egypt? he answered, King Saul. And being asked, who was first circumcised, he could not answer. Wherefore the Archbishop rejected him." Strype, *Grindal*, p. 273.

Resembling Aarons glorie in his place:¹
 For farre unfit it is, that person bace
 Should with vile cloaths approach God's magestie,
 Whom no uncleannes may approachen nie;
 Or that all men which anie master serve,
 Good garments for their service should deserve;
 But he that serves the Lord of hoasts most high,
 And that in highest place, to approach him nigh,
 And all the peoples prayers to present
 Before his throne, as on ambassage sent
 Both too and fro, should not deserve to weare
 A garment better than of wooll or heare.

That Spenser is here directing his satire against the Anglican rather than the Roman clergy, or at least is putting the Anglican in the same category with the Roman in this regard—a practice consistently followed by the Puritan writers—is evident from the couplet that follows, marriage being sanctioned by the Anglican church:

Beside, we may have lying by our sides
 Our lovely Lasses, or bright shining Brides.

The corruption attendant upon the securing of benefices is exposed in the advice given to that end by the priest, and the evils of simony are made a subject of special scorn:

Doo not thou therefore seeke a living there,
 But of more private persons seeke elsewhere.
 Whereas thou maist compound a better penie,
 Ne let thy learning question'd be of anie.
 For some good Gentleman, that hath the right
 Unto his Church for to present a Wight,
 Will cope with thee in reasonable wise;
 That if the living yerely doo arise
 To fortie pound, that then his yongest sonne
 Shall twentie have, and twentie thou hast wonne:
 Thou hast it wonne, for it is of franke gift,
 And he will care for all the rest to shift,
 Both that the Bishop may admit of thee,
 And that therein thou maist maintained bee.²

¹ The propriety or impropriety of following the practice of Aaron's priesthood was the historical starting-point for the discussion of vestments; cf. *Whitgift*, III, 38, Parker Society.

² The extent to which this evil practice was carried is shown by the following passage from a letter to Archbishop Parker under date of 1567: "I sent my visitors into Norwich. Dion's county and mine, to set order and to know the state of the county, whereof I

The practice of holding more than one living, which the Puritans regarded as a very great evil, is brought to book in the conclusion of the episode: the Fox and the Ape, having brought down upon themselves the wrath of their parishoners,

made a composition
With their next neighbor Priest, for light condition,
To whom their living they resigned quight
For a few pence and ran away by night.

Spenser is thus found to voice the general Puritan complaint of the prevailing ignorance of the lower clergy, of the subordination and neglect of preaching, of vestments, of impropriations and advowsons, and of plural livings. Is he, then, an out-and-out follower of Cartwright? Is he, at the time of writing *Mother Hubberds Tale*, in spirit a dissenter? From the foregoing it would seem as though he were, but there yet remains to be determined his attitude toward the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Did he, like Cartwright and his school, wish the English church organization to be assimilated to the presbyterian standard? If he did, in the light of the above he must be regarded as a dissenter; if he did not, he must be classed with the Low Churchmen of the type of Grindal, Jewel, and Pilkington, bishops who accepted the organization of the church, preferred that vestments should not be used—though they yielded this point for the sake of harmony—and steadily strove to correct those abuses in the church that sprang from ignorance or worldliness.

The following verses from the *Mother Hubberds Tale*, taken by themselves, might be regarded as a thrust at the hierarchy, for the offices and titles mentioned are among those which the *Admonition* attacked as having no warrant in the New Testament:

heard, of credible and of worshipful persons, that Gehazi and Judas had a wonderful haunt in the county, that *Quid vultis mihi dare?* had so much prevailed there among the Simonians, that now to sell and to buy benefices, to fleece parsonages and vicarages, that *omnia erant venalia*. And I was informed the best of the country, not under the degree of knights, were infected with this sore, so far that some one knight had four or five, some other seven or eight benefices clouted together, fleecing them all, defrauding the crown's subjects of their duty of prayers, somewhere setting boys and their serving-men to bear the names of such livings. Understanding this enormity, how the gospel was thus universally pinched, to the discouraging of all good laborers in God's harvest, I meant to inquire of it, etc. In such inquisition was presented at Norwich, that my lord had set a serving man not ordered, a mere lay-body, in the face of the whole city, to be a prebendary of the church there, and that he had another at home at his house, another prebendary; and bearing themselves great under my lord's authority, despiseth mine, to be at the Church's visitation, etc."—*Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*, p. 311, Parker Society.

It seemes (said he) right well that ye be Clerks,
 Both by your wittie words, and by your werks,
 Is not that name enough to make a living
 To him that hath a whit of Nature's giving?
 How manie honest men see ye arize
 Daylie thereby, and grow to goodly prize;
 To Deanes, to Archdeacons, to Commissaries,
 To Lords, to Principalls, to Prebendaries?¹

But it is not necessary to regard the passage as other than a criticism of the ease with which unworthy men could gain preferment in the church.

For a conclusive answer to this question of Spenser's attitude toward church organization, the testimony of the *Shepheardes Calender* must be taken in conjunction with that of the *Mother Hubberds Tale*. It is necessary, however, to discuss first the dates of these two poems, as the time of writing may be found to throw not a little light on the significance of the views expressed therein.

¹ Of the office of the dean, Cartwright has the following to say in his *Reply*: "As for the office of a dean, as it is used with us, it is therefore unlawful, for that he being minister hath no several charge or congregation appointed, wherein he may exercise his ministry; and for that he is ruler and as it were master of divers other ministers in the college, which likewise have no several charges or congregations; and for that (which is most intolerable) both he himself, oftentimes having a several church or benefice (as they call it), is under the colour of his deanship absent from his church, and suffereth also those that are underneath him to be likewise absent from their churches. And, whereas M. Doctor allegeth St. Augustine to prove his office to be ancient, indeed the name is there found, but besides the name not one property of the name which we have. For Augustine speaking of the works of those days, saith that the money which they gat with the labour of their hands they gave to their dean, which did provide them meat, and drink, and cloth, and all things necessary for them; so that their monks should not be drawn away from their studies and meditations through the care of worldly things: so that the dean which he speaketh of was servant and steward and cater to the monks, and therefore only called dean because he was steward and cater to works."—*Whitgift*, II, 178, Parker Society.

This passage also reveals the dissenting attitude toward the commissary as an office of dignity.

The office of archdeacon is discussed at length both in the *Admonition* and in the *Reply*, but the whole discussion may be summed up in the one declaration: "Neither did God give any archdeacon to his Church; therefore he cannot profit the Church."

The bestowing of the title of "Lord" upon officers of the church was regarded by the Puritans with intense disfavor, for the practice was held to be unscriptural, and unbecoming the humility of ministers: "Touching their names and titles, he putteth a difference in these words, 'And they are called gracious lords, but it shall not be so with you.' And so the argument may be framed as before, that, forasmuch as they are severed in titles, and that to the civil minister doth agree the title of gracious lords, therefore to the ecclesiastical minister the same doth not agree. For, as it is fit that they whose offices carry an outward majesty and pomp should have names agreeable to their magnificence, so it is meet that those that God hath removed from that pomp and outward shew should likewise be removed from such swelling and lofty titles, as do not agree with the simplicity of the ministry which they exercise."—*Ibid.*, I, 149.

The *Shepheardes Calendar* was completed some time before April 10, 1579, for that is the date of the epistle which precedes it, written by E. K. to Gabriel Harvey. On October 16, 1579, Spenser wrote to Harvey with reference to its dedication; on December 5 it was licensed; on May 9, 1580, Harvey referred to it as "a certain famous booke called the newe Shepheardes Calendar."¹ So much for known dates.

Certain internal references may also be of help in determining the time of writing. In the April eclogue *Hobbinol* (Harvey) alludes to Spenser in the line,

Colin thou kenst, the Southerne shepheardes boye [l. 21],

and the gloss remarks: "Seemeth hereby that Colin perteyneth to some Southern noble man, and perhaps in Surrye or Kent." In the June eclogue *Hobbinol* advises Colin Clout (Spenser) to

Forsake the soyle that so doth thee bewitch
Leave me those hills where harbrough nis to see,
Nor holy-bush, nor brere, nor winding witche:
And to the dales resort, where shepheardes ritch,
And fruitful flocks, bene every where to see [ll. 18-22].

In the gloss—written later than the poem—E. K. defines the dales as: "The Southpartes, where he now abydeth, which though they be full of hylles and woods (for Kent is very hyllye and woodye . . .). Yet in respecte of the Northpartes they be called dales." In the July eclogue is the well-known allusion to the sequestration of Grindal in the fable of the eagle and the shell-fish. In the September eclogue occurs the episode of Roffynn, Lowder, and the Wolf, and Spenser is called the servant of Roffynn in the line,

Colin Clout, I wene, be his selfe boye [l. 176].

The discovery of a volume of *The Traveiler*, by Jerome Tiesler, bearing on the title-page in Harvey's hand the words: "Ex dono Edmundij Spenseriij, Episcopi Roffensis Secretarij, 1578"² finally proves that Roffynn is John Young, Bishop of Rochester, the master

¹ Grosart, l. 90.

² Described in a paper read before the British Academy, November 29, 1907, by Professor Gollancz.

of Pembroke College during Spenser's academic career, and also explains the line

Colin Clout, I wene, be his selfe boye.

This in turn probably explains the reference in the April eclogue,

Colin thou kenst, the Southerne shepheardes boye,

for, as I shall show later, Spenser was in the employ of Young before he was in the employ of Leicester, and as the April eclogue is hardly to be thought of as having been written later than the September eclogue, Young must be the southern shepherd referred to in each of these lines. The advice recorded in the June eclogue as given Spenser by Harvey probably refers to some conversation, thus incorporated in the poem, which took place at the time when Spenser was considering the offer to become secretary to Young. We do not know where Spenser was or what he was doing between the time of proceeding M.A. on June 26, 1576, and taking up the secretaryship, but the chances are that he was in or near Cambridge and in the frequent society of Harvey, for, as a recent writer has observed,¹ the presumption created by the Harvey-Spenser correspondence is that the friends were not separated long before the initial letters thereof.

To recapitulate, the September eclogue was written when Spenser was in the employ of Bishop Young; the April eclogue was almost certainly written at that time; and the June eclogue would seem to have been written then.

Is there reason to think that any of the poem was composed before or after this episcopal secretaryship? I think not. It *may* be that Spenser's change of service, or anticipation of such a change is recorded in the allusion to Leicester in the following advice given Cuddie in the October eclogue:

Abandon, then, the base and viler clowne;
Lyft up thy selfe out of the lowly dust,
And sing of bloody Mars, of wars, of giusts,
Turne thee to those that weld the awful crowne,
And helmes unbruzed wexen dayly browne.
There may thy Muse display her fluttryng wing,
And stretch her selfe at large from East to West;

¹ J. J. Higginson, *Spenser's Shepherd's Calender*, p. 314.

Whither thou list in fayre Elisa rest,
 Or, if thee please in bigger notes to sing,
 Advance the worthy whome shee loveth best,
 That first the white beare to the stake did bring.

Such advice, however, is common enough, and I cannot think that these stanzas have any chronological significance; Spenser is merely counseling one of his friends to seek the patronage of the Court, a program that he himself followed when opportunity afforded itself.

That the July eclogue was written before Spenser entered the service of Leicester is probable from the fact that Grindal was *persona non grata* with the Earl, the Earl even being supposed to have had a hand in humiliating the Bishop.¹ It may be argued that this eclogue was written prior to the secretaryship, because the sequestration of Grindal took place in June, 1577, and Spenser could not have had the office before February 18, 1578, the date of Young's election. But, on the other hand, the expression "lyes in longing payne" would seem to suggest that a considerable time had elapsed between Grindal's humiliation and the writing of the eclogue.

The Roffynn episode is presumptive evidence that the ecclesiastical eclogues, those for May, July, and September—perhaps for February as well²—were all written while Spenser was in the employ of the Bishop, for the eclogues are structurally alike, each one closing with a fable, and this plan of uniform treatment would seem to have been deliberately determined upon. Now as we know that the September eclogue, with its fable of Roffynn, was written while Spenser was Bishop Young's "boye," it is altogether likely that the other eclogues in the series were likewise written during the secretaryship.

Finally, the gloss supports the theory that the eclogues were written during Spenser's association with Young, for the gloss to the June eclogue says that Spenser was living in Kent at the time that the gloss was written.

In conclusion, though Spenser may have followed his practice of incorporating certain verses written at an earlier time, all of the evidence goes to show that the *Shepheardes Calender*, in the form in

¹ Cf. *Harington, Nugae Antiquae*, II, 18; Camden, *Annals*, p. 494; Higginson, p. 306.

² See the discussion of the February eclogue by E. A. Greenlaw, "The Shepheardes Calender," *PMLA*, XXVI, 419, and the criticism of the same by Higginson, pp. 339-46.

which we have it, was conceived, written, and finished, and the gloss to the same prepared by his friend E.K., while the poet was secretary to Bishop Young.

The next step is to determine, so far as may be, the date of the secretaryship. Young was elected bishop of Rochester on February 18, 1578, and was installed on April 1, 1578. Presumably he took Spenser into his service immediately on becoming bishop—if, indeed, Spenser had not been associated with him in some capacity before—for, on learning of his appointment, he would naturally choose a secretary with some care. On December 20, 1578, Spenser presented Harvey with a copy of the romance called *Howleglas*, and this presentation was made at London.¹ Now it would seem probable—though of this we cannot be sure—that this book and *The Traveiler* were presented at the same time, for, as a Fellow, Harvey could not easily be away from the university during terms, and on this occasion he had probably gone up to London for the Christmas recess. Presumably, then, Spenser was still secretary to Young on December 20, 1578. On the other hand, Spenser's letter to Harvey, dated October 16, 1579, was written from Leicester House, and Spenser was then in the service of the earl.

Is it possible to determine the time of Spenser's change of service even more exactly? The "Epistle by E.K." to Gabriel Harvey is dated April 10, 1579. Now, as we have seen, the gloss for June speaks of Spenser as being in Kent. Therefore, unless a considerable time elapsed between the writing of the gloss for June and of the "Epistle"—and this seems contrary to probability—Spenser could not have left the secretaryship under Young long before April 10.² Yet at Easter of 1579 Spenser was in London, and apparently a resident there, for in a letter dated "beinge the 10 of this present, and as beautiful a summer daye as came this summer—1579,"³ Harvey speaks of Spenser as "de London in comitatu Middlesex,"⁴ alludes to his "lively copesmates in London,"⁵ and in the postscript asks if

¹ Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library*, p. 92.

² To be sure the "Epistle" remarks on the poet as "being for long time furre estranged," but this may mean nothing more than that the writer now sees little of his friend. Without the weight of strong additional evidence it certainly is presumptuous to take this as referring to foreign service performed for Leicester.

³ Grosart, *Harvey*, I, 120.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 121.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 125.

Spenser has "so forgotten our long Westminster conference the verie last Ester terme."¹ In all probability, therefore, Spenser entered the service of Leicester sometime in the spring of 1579.

In passing, it is worth the suggestion that light may also be thrown on the dates by the Roffynn episode. This episode is clearly based upon some trouble between Bishop Young and an aggressive Roman Catholic. Just what it was, we cannot say, but in view of the fact that Thomas Watson, the "chief superior of the English Catholic clergy," the very heart of the papal cause in England, was transferred to the keeping of the Bishop of Rochester at the request of the Bishop of Winchester, who had been burdened with the custody of Watson for five years, I think it not unlikely that the episode in some way relates to him, possibly to an effort on his part to win over to his own faith Young's chancellor, Lloyd (Lowder). Now this transference took place in January, 1579, so that, if there is any force in this suggestion, Spenser did not leave the service of Young until some time subsequent thereto. Incidentally, this would also seem to show that the poem was composed quickly, for the September eclogue would thus have to be written subsequent to January, 1579, and yet the gloss was composed and the "Epistle" written by April 10.

In any case, the poem was written some time between January, 1578, and April, 1579, at least a part of it was written while Spenser was secretary to a bishop, and the criticisms of ecclesiastical conditions, instead of reflecting the bitterness of an antagonist from without, express the concern of a churchman who was attached, by friendship and by service, to an important member of the hierarchy.

The *Mother Hubberds Tale* contains two definite allusions. In l. 7 there is allusion to the plague, which devastated England in the summer of 1577 and lasted for two years, and in l. 628 allusion to Elizabeth's displeasure at the marriage of Leicester and the Countess of Essex. As the Queen did not know of this marriage until mid-summer of 1579, the latter half of the poem was not written before August of that year. On the other hand, the allusion loses its force if it was not written practically at the time.

Now the poem falls into two parts: the first being primarily a satire on ecclesiastical conditions; the second, a satire on the court.

¹ Grosart, *Harvey*, I, 124.

The latter again falls into two divisions: the first, describing the Fox and Ape at Court, with its contrast of the true and the false courtier, and its berating of Burleigh; the second, the assumption of the Lion's power by the Fox and Ape, with their discomfiture when the Lion wakes, a very harsh piece of satire. There seems every reason to believe that this last episode is, as Professor Greenlaw has so ably maintained,¹ a warning of the danger of an alliance between Elizabeth and the duke of Alençon.

What then are the most probable dates for the composition of this poem? Leicester was bitterly opposed to the marriage; Spenser of course knew that this was the case. Moreover, it was because of Leicester's opposition that Simier had revealed to Elizabeth the truth of the Earl's marriage. What more natural than that the young poet, anxious to secure the further favor of his patron, should employ his choice gift of satire to deride his master's enemies? Who knows, in fact, but the patron placed the order himself? Now the marriage negotiations reached their height in October, 1579, so presumably the poem was written before this. Furthermore, on October 13, Stubbs lost his right hand for having written his *Gaping Gulph*, a satire on the proposed marriage, and it is hardly to be supposed that Spenser would have courted a like punishment.

Taking these events into account, and remembering that it was in the summer that the Queen learned of Leicester's marriage, one is forced to conclude that the latter half of the poem was written between August 1 and October 13. A young poet-courtier, full of glowing hopes for the future and yet shocked at the baseness of court life, with true Renaissance resourcefulness and disregard of consistency contrives to depict the hypocrisy and intrigues of the court and yet at the same time to flatter his patron as the ideal courtier and to salve his wounded pride by an allegorical satire on his enemies. The first part of the poem could have been written any time between the summer of 1577 and the summer of 1579, but is it not altogether likely that, just as the satire on court life is written from first-hand observation, the satire on ecclesiastical conditions is written from like observation, and is the outcome of Spenser's intimate contact with them? While he had heard at Cambridge much discussion of these

¹ "Spenser and the Earl of Leicester," *PMLA*, XXV, 555.

evils, as a bishop's secretary he met them in the concrete. So I take it that this first part of the poem was written in 1578 or 1579, when Spenser was secretary to Young or shortly after he had left the office. Perhaps the middle of the poem, with its transition from Church to State, actually marks the poet's change of secretaryship from Young to Leicester.

So much for the dates of the *Shepherd's Calendar* and the *Mother Hubberd's Tale*. It has been found that the criticism of ecclesiastical affairs contained in these poems was written, in the main at least, when Spenser himself was actually in the service of the church, or had shortly before been in such service. We must henceforth interpret the poet's Puritanism in the light of this fact.

And now to return to the question so long in abeyance: Was Spenser opposed to the hierarchy? At least he was willing to serve under it. Did he disbelieve in bishops? At least he could say of one who was conspicuous "for his quickness in government,"

Shepherd's such, God mought us many send,
That doen so carefully theyr flocks tend.

But there is not wanting more specific evidence than this, for the poet's attitude toward the hierarchy is expressly defined in the May eclogue. Piers gives a review of the history of the priesthood from apostolic times, showing how God's ministers had gradually departed from the unworldly traditions of the Apostolic church, when Christ was the sole possession of value, until

Some gan to gape for greedie governaunce,
And match them selfe with mighty potentates,
Lovers of Lordship, and troublers of states.

Taken by itself this passage might be regarded as showing antipathy to the hierarchy, as voicing the Puritan protest against Lords Spiritual, but it is provided with a very careful gloss in which those who would destroy the organization of the church are condemned as malicious and destructive. It is not to be thought that Spenser would have been so hypocritical as to allow this gloss to misrepresent his feeling toward the opponents of the church: "*Some gan*, meant of the Pope, and his Antichristian prelates, which usurpe a tyrannical dominion in the Church, and with Peters counterfeit keyes open a

wide gate to al wickednesse and violent government, nought here spoken as of purpose to deny fatherly rule and governaunce (as some maliciously of late have done, to the great unreste and hinderaunce of the Churche) but to displaye the pride and disorder of such, as, in steede of feeding their sheepe, indeede feede of theyr sheepe." "Fatherly rule" is the rule of the bishop, who is, in the customary language of the church, the "Reverend Father in God." This gloss, whether written by Spenser or by one of his friends, is expressly designed to voice the poet's attitude toward the organization of the church.

There can be no question that in these eclogues Spenser condemns in strongest terms the pomp and greed of worldly-minded ecclesiastics, their love of office for its own sake, of soft living, of fat benefices, of fine linen and robes, but in each of the three eclogues he holds up for admiring approval a godly bishop in contrast, in the May and July eclogues Bishop Grindal, in the September eclogue Bishop Young. The July eclogue is practically devoted to a contrast of Grindal and Aylmer, and the September eclogue pays this tribute to Bishop Young:

Say it out, Diggon, whatever it hight,
For not but well mought him betight:
He is so meeke, wise, and merciable,
And with his word his worke is convenable.

Shepheardes sich, God mought us many send,
That doen so carefully theyr flocks tend.

If we could know more of the character of Bishop Young, it would be fortunate, but we do know that he was a friend of Grindal's, having at one time been his chaplain, having preached the sermon when he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and having been recommended by him for the headship of Pembroke College.¹ We also know that he was regarded as an efficient administrator and a ready scholar, that, as master of Pembroke and vice-chancellor, he objected to the ecclesiastical commissioners exercising any jurisdiction within the university in the matter of vestments,² that he was loved and admired by his students,³ that, on his own testimony, he never sought

¹ See Strype, *Grindal*, p. 460.

² See Harvey's letters, frequently.

³ *Calendar State Papers, Domestic*.

preferment,¹ that he lived very frugally and deplored the extravagance of the day,² and that he was not afraid to address the great Burleigh fearlessly and vigorously when occasion required.³ Such a man represented the type of chancellor of whom Spenser approved.

To summarize in the briefest terms this answer to the question of Spenser's loyalty to the establishment, the poet's service under Bishop Young, the praise of Grindal and Young in the eclogues, and the very carefully expressed gloss, all are evidence that he upheld the order of the church.

On the other hand, his scathing denunciations of ecclesiastical abuses are evidence that he felt that some of the worst foes of the church were those of her own household, pastors who, instead of feeding their sheep, "fed of them." The first part of the *Mother Hubberds Tale* and the ecclesiastical eclogues are a warning to the evangelical wing of the church against the twofold danger of a re-establishment of Roman Catholicism and of the continuance in the national church of practices akin to those of Rome. As a Low Churchman, he did not recognize any very sharp line between the High Churchman and the Roman Catholic, and appreciated the constant danger of the High Church party swinging over to Roman Catholicism if a turn in public affairs should warrant it. The September eclogue in particular, after depicting in true Elizabethan fashion the supposed evil practices of Rome, points out the similarities between the corruption of the Roman church and of the Anglican church,⁴ likens the Papists to wolves, and the High Church party to foxes, and alludes with alarm to the aggressiveness of the Roman Catholic missionaries. The Bishop of Rochester and his young secretary were probably peculiarly alive to this danger, for Kent lay on the seaboard and Rochester was a natural port of entry for the Roman Catholic missionaries. When one recalls that thirteen such missionaries landed in 1578 and twenty-one in 1579, it is easy to understand the alarm that dictated the following verses:

Yes, but they gang in more secret wise,
And with sheepes clothing doen hem disguise.
They walke not widely as they were wont,

¹ Strype, *Annals*, IV, 315.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Id.* 74-135.

For feare of raungers and the great hunt,
 But prively prolling to and froe,
 Enaunter they mought be inly knowe.

I think the examination of the evidence has now been carried far enough to justify the conclusion that Spenser as a young man was a Low Churchman belonging to that earnest part of men who, without any disloyalty to the church, felt that it needed purifying, needed to be relieved from political machinations, needed a better educated and a more godly clergy, needed to be protected against the encroachments of Rome.

In one respect Spenser held a position that was not characteristic of any party to the ecclesiastical controversies, and that was his extreme antipathy to marriage among the clergy. This is interesting as showing his independence. It might be thought at first blush that he assumed this attitude to court royal approval, but the fact that he boldly ridiculed Elizabeth's distrust of preaching and prophesying ought to relieve him from this charge.

I see no reason for thinking that Spenser materially changed his views about the church as he grew older; though he may have grown somewhat more conservative with years and with long public service. In the *View of the Present State of Ireland*, written twelve or fifteen years later than *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Mother Hubberds Tale*, one meets the same indignation at trifling ministers, the same contempt for their marriage:

It is greate wonder to see the oddes which is betweene the zeale of Popish priests, and the Ministers of the Gospell; for they spare not to come out of Spayne, from Rome, and from Rhemes, by long toyle and dangerous travell hither, where they know perill of death awayteth them, and noe rewarde nor richness to be founde, only to drawe the people to the Church of Rome; whereas some of our idell ministers, having a waye for credit and estimation thereby opened unto them, and having the livings of the countrey offered them, without paynes, and without perrill, will neither for the same, nor for any love of God, nor zeale of religion, nor for all the good they might doe by winning of soe many sowles to God, be drawn foorth from their warme nests and theyre sweete loves side to looke out into Godes harvest, which is even readye for the sickle, and all the fields yellowe long agoe: doubtless those good old godly Fathers will (I fear me) rise up in the Daye of Judgment to condemn them.¹

¹ Macmillan edition, p. 479.

In a later passage of the same essay he expresses impatience with those who criticize the form and order of the church, but whether this shows any change in his attitude altogether depends on just what he had in mind when he spoke of "form" and "order":

Next care in religion is to builde up and repayre all the ruinous churches, whereof the most parte lye even within the grounde, and some that have been lately repayred are so unhandsomely patched and thatched, that men doe even shunne the places for the uncomeliness thereof; therefore I would wish that there were order taken to have them built in some better form, according to the churches of England; for the outward shew (assure your selfe) doth greatly drawe the rude people to the reverencing and frequenting thereof, what ever some of our late to nice fooles saye, "there is nothing in the seemely forme and comely orders of the churche."¹

Be that as it may, he was certainly out of sympathy with the Marprelate school, for whether Jonson was right or not in identifying the Blatant Beast with the Puritans,² there is general agreement that the following lines from the *Cantos of Mutabilitie*³ are a contemptuous reference to the lugubrious gravity of a certain type of Puritan:

And backward yode, as Bargemen wont to fare,
Bending their force contrary to their face;
Like that ungracious crew which faines demurest grace.

Again and again Spenser advocates the golden mean in the various relations and activities of life: the golden mean between communism and monopoly, between wealth and poverty, between abstinence and self-indulgence, between prudishness and wantonness, between the life of activity and the life of contemplation. I believe that he was also a consistent advocate of the golden mean in matters ecclesiastical.

F. M. PADELFORD

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
SEATTLE, WASH.

¹ Macmillan edition, p. 680.

² See *Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden*, Edinburgh, 1711, p. 225.

³ VII vii 35, 7-9.

JOHN BUT, MESSENGER AND MAKER

The *Piers Plowman* controversy has recently taken a turn which makes this "silly scribbler" and "fool" (as M. Jusserand calls him) the center of dispute. In an article in the *Modern Language Review* for July, 1911, Mr. R. W. Chambers uses him to support the single-author theory; while in the *Modern Language Review* for January, 1913, Mr. Henry Bradley points out external evidence in regard to a John But, and adds:

If we could assume (1) that the John But of the Rawlinson MS is identical with the John But of the Patent Rolls; (2) that he wrote not only the twelve undisputed lines but also the seventeen lines preceding them in the MS; (3) that when he speaks of William as dead and buried he is stating a fact within his own knowledge; and (4) that the C-revision of *Piers Plowman* cannot have been finished earlier than 1387;—the conclusion would be inevitable that the C-revision is not the work of the original author.¹

Of these four assumptions, he says in effect, that the first three are doubtful, although the second and third seem to him probable, while in regard to the first there is no evidence either way, and perhaps never will be.

I had recently been collecting such documentary evidence as I could find about the name John But in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when I read Mr. Bradley's article; and upon taking up the A-text again, I observed a passage which seems to me to argue strongly that John But, the maker, was certainly John But, the king's messenger who was dead before April 17, 1387.² Among the four or

¹ *MLR*, p. 88.

² As Mr. Bradley says, the name is uncommon; but I have found mention of (1) John But, clerk to the comptroller of customs at Bristol, 1400 (*Antient Kalendar and Inventories of the Treasury of the Exchequer*, II, 60); (2) John But, who was appointed by Thomas Chaucer, chief butler, his deputy at Tawmouth, 1402 (*Calendar Patent Rolls*, 1401-5, p. 169); these two are possibly the same; (3) John But, once called "John Hore alias But," bailiff of Bridport, mentioned between 1428 and 1445 (*Catalogue Ancient Deeds*, I, c. 14, c. 1714, c. 1744); (4) John But of Northtalewrth, who demised some land for twelve years in 1360 (*Cal. of Anc. Deeds*, IV, 452); (5) John But who was one of the four executors of his wife Alice, April 30, 1384, at Salisbury. She owned property enough in Torilton, Devonshire, to have a bailiff (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1381-85, p. 369). None of these can at present be identified, with any degree of probability, with the king's messenger.

five others of that name there is none that can in any way be connected with Piers the Plowman.

But what is the case for the king's messenger? We are at once confronted with the difficulty that we do not know how much of Passus XII of the A-text John But wrote.

Mr. Chambers holds that he wrote either the whole, or only ll. 84-112.¹ Professor Manly² maintains that he began at l. 57. The older view was that he wrote simply ll. 100-112, the first of which begins with his name. As the manuscripts lead to no conclusion, this question must be settled, if at all, from internal evidence. Notwithstanding Mr. Chambers' skepticism as to the value of internal evidence, in this case it is so supported by external evidence as to convince me that the *maker* and the *messenger* were the same man.

My chief argument is based upon ll. 78-82:

I am masager of dep. men haue I tweyne,
 pat on is called cotidian. a courour of oure hous,
 Tercian pat oþer. trewe drinkeres bope!
 We han letteres of lyf. he shal his lyf [tyne;]
 Fro dep, pat is oure duk. swyche dedis we brynge.

—A, XII, 78-82.

In this passage, Fever, who is speaking, describes himself as a messenger from Death his duke (*duke* rather than *king* for the sake of the alliteration), who with his two men bears letters for (*of* is so interpreted by Skeat) Life, to the effect that he shall die; of such a character are the deeds (i.e., documents) that they bring. The two "men" who serve Fever are Cotidian and Tercian; and they are called *courours*.³

The significance of the passage is double:

1. It contains an accurate description of the duty of a messenger and of the difference between a *messenger* and a *courier*, as can be illustrated from John But's own life.
2. It changes the conception of the allegory by introducing a royal messenger where the lines immediately preceding describe quite a different person.

¹ Or 89, as he numbers, to include the additional five lines in the Ingilby manuscript (*MLR*, July, 1911, p. 322).

² *Cambridge History of English Literature*, II, 21-22.

³ The phrase "of our hous" must mean of the household of Death.

If it is psychologically sound that a man of limited ideas draws upon his own experience for figures and illustrations, we can scarcely escape the conclusion that the verse-maker and the messenger were one.

The distinction between *messenger* and *courier* in this passage is undoubtedly correct. It is borne out in the first instance by the entry concerning John But's successor: "Grant, for life, to William Branspathe courier (*cursor*) of the chamber, whom the King has now made messenger," of 4½*d.* a day wages at the exchequer, in the room of John But, deceased."¹

This agrees with the distinction in *Catholicon Anglicon* between: *curroure*=*calcula*, *cursor*, and *messyngere*=*angelus*, *angelicus*, *baiulus*, *emissarius*, *internunci*, *missus*, *nuncius*, and *nunciolus*.

And yet by anyone except one to whom the calling of messenger was very familiar, the distinction between a king's messenger and his subordinates would be likely to be neglected. In point of fact, *courour* does not occur elsewhere in *Piers the Plowman*; the word *messenger*, used much as we use it today, serves all occasions. But to a king's messenger, in referring to his own calling, the couriers in their proper place with reference to himself would be an important factor.

Again, note the detail that these messengers were bearing letters, which were also called *deeds*, to Life, to the effect that his life should cease. The image in the writer's mind is: Death the Duke sends to Life letters by reason of which he is to lose his life. Does not this mean that the letters or deeds contained charges that would lead to death—in other words, that a king's messenger had the power of arrest? Was this true?

In the *New English Dictionary*, in a quotation dated 1696, the word *messenger* (3) is defined as one that attends upon the king and his council to carry dispatches, and waits upon the sergeant-at-arms to apprehend prisoners of state.

But how was it in the fourteenth century? There are several hints in But's own experience which seems to show that he was also an officer of the law.

March 30, 1381, John But, described as *messenger*, prosecuted

¹ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-89, p. 290.

Philip Derneford, vintner of London, for a trespass in the county of Gloucester.¹ Derneford's forfeited goods and chattels were returned to him, so he was evidently found to be innocent. Whatever "prosecuted" means here, it suggests some legal function, as the characterization *messenger* suggests that But was acting officially. The passage I shall quote next bears out the theory that he would have received part or all of the forfeited goods, if Derneford had been found guilty.

October 8, 1378, John But, "one of the king's messengers," had a grant of lands and tenements in Barton-on-Humber, forfeited by William Bryan for felony.² In this case, it is possible that the gift was a mere act of royal favor, not given because But had had anything to do with the arrest of the prisoner. And yet, in view of the ancient custom of rewarding people who brought others to justice, with the lands and goods of the offenders, it is perfectly possible that these lands were a reward for good service in catching Bryan.

December 3, 1371, John But and two others not described were deputed to transfer a prisoner from the Marshalsea to the castle of the Prince of Wales at Wallingford.³ Here But is not described as a messenger, but he is certainly acting as an officer of the law.

To sum up, in ll. 78-82, we have a description which implies a "technical" knowledge of the rank and duty of a messenger. In the A- and B-texts there is only one other reference to this calling, and that is in the phrase "minstrels and messengers" (A, II, 203; B, II, 227; C, III, 237, and X, 136). C adds a long allegory of the merchant and the messenger, in which the messenger is treated entirely from the standpoint of the observer; i.e., the messenger can soon do his errand; he cannot be stopped from crossing a wheat field; he carries only a box with a letter in it; he is "merry, his mouth full of songs"; he shows by seal and by letter with what lord he dwells.⁴

It will perhaps save space if I quote the entire passage, beginning with the line at which Professor Manly thinks John But began, and including within brackets the five additional lines in the Ingilby manuscript:

¹ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1377-81, p. 615.

² *Ibid.*, 1377-81, p. 280.

³ *Calendar Close Rolls*, 1369-74, p. 275. As this is the last published volume of the *Close Rolls*, those between 1374 and 1385 may contain more information about But.

⁴ C, XIV, 33-89. There is only one other passage in which a messenger is named and that calls Grace Christ's messenger, C, XXII, 207-8.

- And wente forþ on my way . *with omnia probate,*
 And ere I cam to þe court . *quod-bonum-est-tenete,*
 Many ferlys me by-fel . in a fewe ȝeris.
 The fyrste ferly I fond . a-fyngrid me made;
 As I ȝede thurgh ȝoure . a-ȝen prime dayes, 60
 I stode stille in a stodie . and stared a-bowte;
 "Al hay!" quod on þo, and I answered "welcome . *and with whom*
 be ȝe?"
 "I am dwellyng with deth . and hunger I hatte,
 To lyf in his lordshepe . longyt my weye, 64
 I shal felle þat freke . in a fewe dayes!"
 [To kyllyn him, ȝif I can; thei kynde wit helpe,]
 "I wolde folwe þe fayn . but fentesye me hendeþ,
 Me folweþ such a fentyse . I may no ferþer walke."
 "Go we forþ," quod þe gom . "I haue a gret boyste 68
 At my bak, of broke bred . þi bely for to fylle;
 A bagge ful, of a beggere . I bouȝþe hit at onys."
 Than maunȝed I wit [him] . vp at þe fulle,
 For þe myssyng of mete . no mesour I coude. 72
 [But ete as hunger me hete . til my belly swellyd.
 Ther bad me hunger 'haue gode day' . but I helde me stille;
 For gronyng of my guttys . I durst gon no ferther.]
 With þat cam a knaue . *with a confessoures face,*
 [Lene & rewlyche . *with leggy's ful smale;*]
 He halsed me and I . asked him after,
 Of when þat he were . and wheder þat he wolde.
 "With deþ I duelle," quod he . "dayes and nyȝtes; 76
 Mi name is feure, on þe ferþe day . I am a-prest euere;
 I am masager of deþ . men haue I tweyne,
 þat on is called cotidian . a courour of oure hous,
 Tercian þat oþer . trewe drinkeres boþe! 80
 We han letteres of lyf . he shal his lyf [tyne;]
 Fro deþ, þat is oure duk . swyche dedis we brynge."
 "Myȝth I so, god wot . ȝoure gates wolde I holden."
 "Nay, wil!" quod þat wyȝth . "wend þou no ferther, 84
 But lyue as þis lyf . is ordeyned for the,
 þou tomblest wiþ a trepget . ȝif þou my tras folwe;
 And mannes merþe wrouȝþ no mor . þan he deseruyþ here,
 Whyl his lyf and his lykhame . lesten to-gedere. 88
 And þer-fore do after do-wel . whil þi dayes duren,
 þat þi play be plenteuous . in paradys with aungelys.
 þou shalt be lauzth into lyȝth . *with loking of an eye,*
 So þat þou werke þe word . þat holy wryt techeþ, 92
 And be prest to preyeres . and profitable werkes."

Wille [wiste] purgh in-wit— . þou wost wel þe soþe— þat þis speche was spedelich . and sped him wel faste, And wrouȝthe þat here is wryten . and oþer werkes boþe	96
Of peres þe plowman . and mechel puple al-so; And whan þis werk was wrouȝt . ere wille myȝte a-spie, Deþ delt him a dent . and drof him to þe erþe, And is closed vnder clom . crist haue his soule!	100
And so bad Iohan but . busily wel ofte, When he saw þes sawes . busily a-legged By Iames and Ierom . by Iop and by oþere, And for he medlep of makyng . he made þis ende.	104
Now alle kenne creatures . þat cristene were euere, God for his goudnesse . gif hem swyche happes, To lyue as þat lord lykþ . þat lyf in hem putte. Furst to rekne Richard . kyng of þis rewme,	108
And alle lordes þat louyn him . lely in herte, God saue hem sound . by se and by land; Marie moder and may . for man þou by-seke; þat barn bryng vs to blys . þat bled vp-on þe rode! Amen.	112

The following points are to be noted:

1. *Omnia-probate* is last mentioned in l. 56.
2. *Quod-bonum-est-tenete*, in l. 57.
3. Kynde Wit, in the Ingilby manuscript only, between ll. 66–67.
4. The three lines between ll. 72 and 73, found only in the Ingilby manuscript, are needed for the sense.

5. The line between ll. 73 and 74 harmonizes with the preceding and seems unlikely to be an invention of the scribe; otherwise, its authenticity cannot be determined.

It is clear that somewhere in this passage where the composition takes a sharp turn from the search for Kynde Wit, with the characters and scene involved, to a meeting of Will with Hunger and Fever successively and the summary of his life and death, John But has taken up the pen. Now the author pictures Hunger with a beggar's wallet; Fever, as a knave with a confessor's face [Ingilby: "lean and pitiable, with full small legs"]; and so far the sequence seems to me logical: feeding on the beggar's scraps of Hunger would naturally bring on Fever; Fever is naturally described as looking like a confessor and emaciated; then suddenly, in l. 78, the conception changes:

Fever becomes a king's messenger with letters that will make an end of Life. If Hunger feeds Will out of his wallet, should not Fever, according to the text, confess him? But no, when the king's messenger announces that he is on his way to kill Life, and Will wishes to accompany him, Fever rebukes him and sends him away, bidding him "do after Do-wel" and he will be rewarded. In other words, the introduction of Fever leads nowhere in the allegory. The allegory practically stops after the confessor-knave has turned into a king's messenger; and the remainder of the passus is plain statement. The only natural explanation that I can find for this state of things is, that John But, in taking up the allegory, with his experience of life inferred from ll. 63-64 that Hunger was a messenger of Death, and seized the occasion to elaborate the idea in the treatment of Fever, not observing how his addition changed the original conception of Fever. After that, his invention ceased—a man of little imagination draws upon his own trade, his own life-experience, and can go no further. A sailor gets his figures and illustrations from the sea, a farmer from country life, a policeman or a king's messenger from the experiences of his calling. It is only the vivid imagination of the creative mind that can project itself into many sorts of experience.

If this reasoning is psychologically sound and in accord with the text itself,¹ I think we may safely believe that the messenger was also the maker of about thirty-five verses of *Piers the Plowman*.²

Mr. Bradley's third assumption remains to be dealt with: Did John But know what he was talking about?

It will, I suppose, be granted that he had no discoverable motive

¹ It is, of course, possible that his work goes back to l. 57, as Professor Manly suggested; but I doubt whether a continuator whose object was merely to make an end (l. 104) would have introduced the idea of "many ferlys," or have begun with a "fyrst": while if But took up the work after two had been introduced, he naturally would finish the second and then tack on his conclusion. He would have to finish the account of Fever or drop some of the text; and the fact is that after Fever disappears there is no more allegory (except the commonplace personification of Death in l. 99) in the passus.

Mr. Chambers' belief that the end of Ingilby MS (l. 83 of Rawlinson) may mark the transition, is based simply upon the probability that the Ingilby scribe had no more to copy. To be sure, his original may have lost its last leaf with the missing seventeen lines; but unless he had expected some day to get more to copy, why did he not crowd his last line into the preceding page, instead of beginning a new blank page with it?

² In l. 110, the phrase "by se and land" which does not occur elsewhere in *Piers the Plowman*, suggests the attitude of the traveler, just as ll. 108-9 suggest familiarity with the court of Richard; but both indications are too slight to be more than corroborative.

for lying, that at least he believed Will to be dead when he wrote. The problem resolves itself into two questions:

1. What was his motive in making an end?
2. What kind of man was he, and what opportunities had he for knowing the truth?

The first question is, I think, answered in the text itself, ll. 101-4, which, taken quite literally, say: And so John But often prayed busily when he saw these saws (stories) busily alleged (claimed to be) by James, Jerome, Job, and others, and because he meddled with (verse-) making, he made this end.

The usual interpretation of ll. 102-3 is: And because he saw these *sayings* busily *quoted from* James, etc.

What are the quoted "sayings"? According to Professor Skeat's *Index*, Jerome is not quoted at all; he is simply named with three other Church Fathers, and not in A (B, XIX, 265; C, XXII, 270); James is quoted twice, in B and C only,¹ and not named; Job is quoted six times in C and three times in B, but only one of these passages is found in A; and Job is not named in A except here, XII, 103.

In the light of these facts, the usual interpretation must be wrong. Even if it were right, what possible motive could it give John But for writing? What did it matter from whom the quotations came?

The only interpretation I can find that will at once make sense of the passage and supply But with a motive is found in the literal rendering given above with the parenthetical meanings of *saws*² and *alleged*³; i.e., when he saw other people busily claiming Will's work, he felt bound to write and tell what the author really wrote, and set his name to it. L. 103 I take to be merely the alliterative equivalent of Tom, Dick, and Harry. If it has a biblical twist that has misled scholars, this is possibly meant to suggest that the claimants were ecclesiastical writers, though I should not press this point, holding rather that it came from difficulties with the alliteration.⁴

¹ The *Index* misses one case in A; I, 159 ff.

² N. E. D. *Saw* (2).

³ N. E. D. *alleged* (3); *Anderson's Dictionary of Law*.

⁴ Note that the common names William, John, Richard, and Piers were necessarily barred; also that in *Piers the Plowman* itself certain other names had come to have a special significance. Thus it would not have done to write Tom (associated with Tinker) or Mund (the Miller), or Reynald (the Reeve) or Bet (the Beadle), etc.

Beyond But's own statement I should not attempt to go for a motive. It may be that his prayer for Will's soul implies some personal acquaintance, that his prayer for King Richard implies that Richard suggested the task to him; but all that it is safe to say is that, holding a position at Court where he came into daily contact with the King, he would not have mentioned Richard's name if Will's work were viewed with disfavor there, nor would he have been likely to attach his own name under those circumstances.

What kind of man was he? Responsible, certainly. He held the post of King's messenger from 1378, probably from 1371, until his death in 1387.

Some idea of his standing may be obtained from the entry in the *Issues of the Exchequer* for April 3, 1386, which shows that he was sent to Sir Matthew Gournay, Guy, Lord Bryan, Sir John Sully¹ and other knights, with letters from the King saying that the Feast of the Garter was postponed.²

He himself was a man of substance, owning at least some land; and his salary and perquisites were reckoned at £10 a year or more, as his successor exchanged them for that annuity.³

As for his opportunity to hear all the news that was going, there was none better in all England than that of a man who was constantly at Court and constantly wandering about the world.

If there is no good reason for doubting the truth of But's testimony, what does it mean?

It means first that there can be no allusion, in ll. 96-97, to Text C, which, scholars agree, did not come out before 1393, six years after But's death.⁴

¹ These three lived in Somerset and Devonshire.

² *Issues of the Exchequer*, III, 229.

³ *Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1385-89, p. 290.

⁴ Mr. Chambers (*MLR*, July, 1911, pp. 309 ff.) argues from the relationship of the MSS that John But must have added his lines to a manuscript which already contained Passus I-VIII, as well as *Do-Wel*. Without attempting to discuss the relationship of the manuscripts, which I have not seen, I may point out that the chain of reasoning presented by Mr. Chambers (*op. cit.*, p. 314) has at least one weak link, the assumption that But must have added his lines to a manuscript that already contained the rest of A. It is at least a conceivable case that he read the *Plowman* visions and the *Do-Wel* separately, took a sheet of parchment to finish the latter, and had a fair copy of the whole made for himself in the very scriptorium from which had been sent out one or more copies of both without his addition. Instead of a common ancestor, I should incline to postulate a common birth-place for the main group of A manuscripts and for John But's manuscript as the ancestor of Rawlinson and perhaps of Ingilby. As soon as any other mode of derivation is seen to have been possible, the word *must* must be discarded.

Then if "oper werkes bope" (l. 96) cannot include C, we must find another meaning for ll. 96-97. The simplest interpretation is Mr. Bradley's, that But is referring to the two distinct visions of Passus I-VIII (whether existing separately or already connected) and to the *Do-Wel*, as the genuine works of Will.¹

The question will be raised: But what of Text B, which must have been in circulation when But wrote? Exactly! Even if But wrote at the very beginning of Richard's reign, B was then in existence. Does not this very fact furnish a starting-point for But's work? Finding that the "saws" of Piers and of *Do-wel* were being passed about, and that there was confusion as to their authorship, John But took the trouble to make an end that should at once tell people that Will did not write anything more than the works he named, for the good reason that Death interrupted him. This is nothing more than a hypothesis, but it seems to me in entire accord with But's own statements.

Whether or not the "dent" that Death struck Will came in the pestilence of 1376, John But's testimony, in the light of the preceding discussion, seems to me to bear out Professor Manly's theory that *Piers the Plowman* was the work of several men, without including the messenger-maker himself.²

EDITH RICKERT

CHICAGO, ILL.

¹ Quite apart from the considerations urged above, I submit that if it had been possible for poor John But to have read all three versions I do not see how he could have carried away from them the impression that they were three separate works. Again, the shadow of *Do-wel*, *Do-bet*, *Do-best* is so overwhelmingly over the B and C that it would have been almost impossible for anyone to have summed them up as works of "peres þe plowman and mechel puple," while this description exactly fits A, I-VIII.

² From the foregoing it would seem that *Do-wel* was a rough and imperfect draft of an unfinished poem, which is greatly inferior to *Piers the Plowman*. But we cannot tell how much we need to allow for age, sickness, or other difficulties unknown.

CHAUCER'S TESTIMONY AS TO HIS AGE

Some years ago, when first seeing in the volumes of the *Scrope and Grosvenor Controversy* the suggestion of Sir Harris Nicolas that discredit or inconclusiveness belongs to Chaucer's testimony regarding his age in 1386, it occurred to me that the reasoning had little to commend it. Now that the suggestion of Sir Harris has been urged with apparently greater force by Mr. Samuel Moore in *Anglia*, XXV, 1-8, it seems worth examining more carefully. The reasoning of Sir Harris Nicolas may be baldly stated in syllogistic form. Some men who testified in the Scrope and Grosvenor heraldic trial were, let us not say members of an early Ananias club, but at least too careless of exactness. Chaucer was a man who testified in the aforesaid trial. Therefore Chaucer's testimony cannot be trusted.

Placed in this form the fallacy of the reasoning appears at once. Nor is the argument essentially better in the form now stated by Mr. Moore. Twenty-three of those who testified in the Scrope and Grosvenor trial varied from their true ages, as ascertained from other documents, by from three to seventeen years. Fourteen others varied from their true ages, as otherwise ascertained, either one or two years. Chaucer testified in the trial aforesaid, though we have no independent testimony as to his inaccuracy. Still we may not trust Chaucer's testimony, because some of his fellow-witnesses were inaccurate, and he may have been so.¹

It is evident that this reasoning does not much assist us in the main point, the interpretation of Chaucer's testimony. It will be

¹ I have no desire to cavil at Mr. Moore's reasoning. Yet it may be pointed out that he assumes inaccuracy of four of the twenty-three witnesses on the Scrope side, by the statement of their ages when called in behalf of Grosvenor. This is scarcely independent evidence of a sufficient sort. If these four cannot be depended upon when called on the one side, their statements cannot be assumed to be correct when called on the other. These witnesses should rather be thrown out altogether, or at least wholly discredited. That would leave, of the twenty-three cited by Mr. Moore, nineteen who show considerable inaccuracy in the statement of their ages, besides fourteen who come within two years of their exact age. I refer to those mentioned by name in the above article. Moreover, so far as I can determine from Mr. Moore's statements, these four are the only ones who overstated their ages, a procedure quite at variance with the general practice in such cases as we shall see. There is thus another reason for distrusting their testimony in one place or the other.

clear to all, I think, that the faulty memories or deliberate deceptions of any number of Chaucer's fellow-witnesses do not really reflect upon his integrity. If it suggests a possibility of error, that error must be proved by independent evidence in Chaucer's individual case. It cannot be logically inferred from the testimony of others regarding themselves. Even if a conspiracy to conceal the truth could be proved against them, it would not involve Chaucer without independent evidence that he was a conspirator.

Nor does Mr. Moore's conjecture, that the age of the witness may have been the guess of some recording clerk, seem to be necessary, as I shall presently show. Before doing so, let me call attention to its improbability in Chaucer's case. If the age of Chaucer, as given in the Scrope and Grosvenor trial, were the guess of a clerk, we must assume the same explanation for the next statement attributed to the poet. When giving his age he also asserted that he had "borne arms twenty-seven years."¹ Now this twenty-seven years leads us back exactly to the year 1359, when we know that Chaucer was with the army of Edward III in France.

Besides, the words of Chaucer are even more exact than the round number twenty-seven implies. His testimony in the Scrope and Grosvenor trial was given on December 15, 1386. In 1359 the truce of Bordeaux had been extended to St. John's Day, June 24. The failure of the peace negotiations was proclaimed by the king on August 12, though Edward and his sons did not leave England until the last of October.² If, therefore, Chaucer's arming had been as early as August, 1359, it was, in December, 1386, at most twenty-seven years and four months that he had "borne arms." This significant part of Chaucer's testimony—for I shall assume it to be Chaucer's until further proof is forthcoming—is therefore accurate to a nicety.³ May we not infer that the witness who was so exact in the one fact was not far wrong in the other statement, that he was

¹ "Armeez par xxvii ans," *Life Records of Chaucer*, p. 265.

² See my article on Chaucer's "First Military Service," *Romanic Review*, III, 325 f.

³ In a brief sketch of the poet's life for a recent edition of *Poems of Chaucer*, I have based the most important inference as to the poet's age upon this part of the testimony. If, as Froissart says, "there was not knight, squire, or man of honor, from the age of twenty to sixty years, that did not go," the first age would just include a youth born in 1340, as the last-mentioned age just included Henry, duke of Lancaster, and under Edward the most important military leader.

"of the age of forty years and more."¹ What interpretation, then, may reasonably belong to the latter expression?

The phrase "of the age of forty years and more" does not, at first sight, lend itself to extreme exactness. Let us see, however. And first Mr. Moore also notes, in his careful examination of the testimony in the Scrope and Grosvenor trial, that a large number of the witnesses gave their ages as forty, fifty, or sixty years, with or without the "and more" (*et plus*). He comments: "It is certainly an extraordinary fact that, among about 140 persons between the ages of thirty-five and sixty-four years of age, there should be more than 75 persons who are said to be either forty, fifty, or sixty years of age." In a footnote he explains that he has disregarded the *et plus* in this computation. Yet before we assume intentional or other inaccuracy here, let us ask what these figures mean in the light of the best modern interpretation of statistics.

It is well known to statisticians of the census that returns of ages always contain a certain element of error. For example, on a-priori grounds it must be assumed that the number of persons of different ages living at one time should vary by a definite arithmetical progression. Thus, as the death-rate is a fairly constant factor, increasing from year to year, there will be fewer persons of the age of twenty-one than of twenty, of twenty-two than of twenty-one, and so on in a regular series. The actual census returns, however, do not show this regular decrease in the number reporting at different ages. In the first place, as a statistical authority states, "More persons return themselves as younger than they are, than as older than they are."² Again, "Concentration is greater on years which are multiples of ten, than on years which are multiples of five and not of ten."³

To correct such recognized inaccuracies, statisticians are accustomed to modify census reports as to ages by various methods. The methods need not concern us here. The character of the

¹ "Del age de xl ans et plus," *Life Records*, p. 265.

² Allyn A. Young, "Comparative Accuracy of Different Forms of Quinquennial Age Groups," *Publications of the American Statistical Association*, VII, 27, p. 38. Professor Young also wrote the article called "Age" in the *Supplementary Analysis of the Twelfth Census*, p. 130.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 27. This concentration of returns on certain years is well illustrated by a chart in *Vital Statistics* (A. Newsholme), p. 3.

discrepancies between the reported ages and the corrected tables are more to the point. Thus, to illustrate the statement above, that more people give their ages as too low than too high, note these figures.¹ In the United States census of 1890, 1,359,566 persons reported themselves as thirty years of age, while only 891,222 reported twenty-nine years, and only 729,771 reported the age thirty-one. The correct figures, according to Professor Young, should have been 984,000 for twenty-nine years, 969,057 for thirty years, 942,977 for thirty-one years. Thus 390,509 more persons reported the age of thirty than were of that age. That is, roughly, more than every fourth person reporting the age of thirty was inaccurate. The exact proportion is 1 to every 3.7 persons.

Moreover, as Professor Young also points out, those persons who were inaccurate in reporting the age of thirty were more probably in excess of thirty rather than below thirty years old. For while, according to his corrected tables, 92,778 fewer than should have done so reported the age of twenty-nine, 213,206 fewer than should have done so reported the age of thirty-one. That is, more than one-fifth of those who were thirty-one understated their age by at least one year, and thus helped to make up the unusually large report for the age of thirty. On the other hand, less than one-tenth of those reporting the age of twenty-nine were inaccurate, and probably few of them reported the age of thirty. Clearly more people in 1890 gave their ages as too low than too high. Besides, such facts are not peculiar to one census, or to one country. So far as census tables show, they represent a tendency common to all peoples and to all periods.

Again, to illustrate the statement above, that age returns in a census today show concentration on multiples of ten, note these figures from Professor Young's table. The actual reports for the years forty, fifty, sixty—to take the ages Mr. Moore uses—were 1,037,336, 776,333, 502,788, respectively. The corrected numbers are, in the same order, 682,948, 516,735, 321,397. Thus the reports in excess of the facts were 354,388 for forty years; 259,598 for fifty years; 181,391 for sixty years. For forty and fifty years the exact proportion of inaccuracy is 1 person in 2.9, for sixty years 1 person

¹ Allyn A. Young, "The Adjustment of Census Age Returns," *Western Reserve University Bulletin*, V, 79 f.; table on p. 101.

in 2.8. At least every third person who reported an even number forty, fifty, or sixty was reporting inaccurately.

The relation of these figures to the testimony as to age by witnesses in the Scrope and Grosvenor trial will be evident. In our own country, in 1890, at least every third person who gave the age of forty, fifty, or sixty years reported himself as somewhat younger than he was. Contrary to Mr. Moore's idea, therefore, it is no matter of surprise that five centuries before, almost to the year, something like the same thing should have taken place. Of the 75 persons out of about 140 between the ages of thirty-five and sixty-four who testified that they were forty, fifty, or sixty years of age, with or without the addition "and more," one-third may be at once assumed to have understated their ages. This leaves 50 out of 140 to be accounted for. If all these added the phrase "and more" to the year given, as Chaucer did, we may suppose they belonged in the groups of years forty to forty-four, fifty to fifty-four, sixty to sixty-four. That is, these are the years to which belong those who wrongly concentrate on forty, fifty, or sixty by understating their ages. Now these groups include, in all, fifteen years, or one-half the period Mr. Moore takes for his basis of comparison. It would be natural enough if 50 out of 140, or a little more than one-third, had been of ages falling in one-half of the time specified, the period between the ages of thirty-five and sixty-four. Indeed, if the whole 75, only slightly more than one-half the 140, should be included in the fifteen years cited above, it would be quite within reason. As I have not access at present to the volumes of Sir Harris Nicolas on the *Scrope and Grosvenor Controversy*, I do not know exactly how many witnesses added the phrase *et plus* to the year of age given.¹ Nor is this necessary. Even if only a part did, the general tendency in such cases to concentrate on multiples of ten, probably stronger five centuries ago than today, would fairly account for the facts. It is therefore wholly unnecessary to suppose, as Mr. Moore does, that the ages attributed to the witnesses were the guess of a recording clerk.

¹ Fortunately Chaucer was one of these. We must infer that he was not content with the general concentration on a multiple of ten, and this "and more" must therefore be reckoned with in his particular case. Even in the case of other witnesses Mr. Moore is scarcely justified in disregarding this "*et plus*" as practically meaningless. The phrase may have meant different things to different individuals, but at least has some significance.

Let there be no misunderstanding of this argument. It is not my purpose to prove the accuracy of the witnesses in the Scrope and Grosvenor trial, and hence reason for Chaucer's accuracy as well. To do that would be but to repeat, in another form, the fallacious reasoning of Sir Harris Nicolas. I have tried to show that the inaccuracies of the witnesses are not so remarkable as they have been supposed to be. That they are not so different from similar inaccuracies under circumstances not wholly dissimilar today. Yet our main interest is with the testimony of a single individual, the poet Chaucer, whose appearance in this trial makes one more definite fact of his life.

Can we, then, in the light of modern statistics, make a more exact interpretation of Chaucer's reference to his age as "forty years and more."¹ Let us begin with another conclusion of Professor Young regarding the census statistics of 1890. He says:

It would appear that the four years below forty (thirty-six to thirty-nine) are excessively large as compared with the years above forty (forty-one to forty-four). This is probably chargeable in part to a peculiar tendency on the part of those whose ages are greater than forty to return themselves as less than forty. It would seem also that the concentration on the year forty is drawn in but very slight degree from years less than forty.²

This means, as applied to the testimony in the Scrope and Grosvenor trial, that those who testified they were forty years of age were certainly as old as that, and perhaps a little more. That is, understatement, not overstatement, of age is the rule. If, then, Chaucer had acknowledged forty years only in 1386, we may reasonably infer he could not have been less than that age. Mr. Moore is quite incorrect, therefore, in assuming from the inaccuracies of other witnesses that Chaucer may have been "only thirty-six or thirty-eight years old."³ Overstatement of age cannot be assumed as likely, and cannot be argued in a case for which we have no independent testimony. Besides, if there is a tendency in the present age to hesitate in acknowledging forty years, it was probably much stronger at a time when the age of forty was regarded as "old," or approaching old age.⁴

¹ It is some years since I purposed to make the application of modern age statistics to this problem. Mr. Moore's article merely gives the occasion.

² Allyn A. Young, "Comparative Accuracy," etc., as above, pp. 36-37.

³ P. 6 of *Anglia* article cited above.

⁴ Compare Chaucer's own allusion to his old age in the *Envoy to Scogan*, probably written when he was at most fifty-three years old, and Skeat's comment, with other examples, in *Works of Chaucer*, I, xvi.

Can we go one step farther? What light do modern statistics throw upon the further acknowledgment of Chaucer in his "forty years and more"? The authority of Professor Young has already been quoted to show that the concentration in the census reports upon the year forty is drawn mainly from the years forty-one, forty-two, forty-three, forty-four. Thus, the 354,388 who wrongly reported their age as forty in the census of 1890 are assumed by Professor Young to belong to the years forty-one, forty-two, forty-three, forty-four in the sums 171,239, 5,225, 81,078, and 96,846, respectively. Arranged in the order of frequency given, the years of these inaccurate reports are forty-one, forty-four, forty-three, forty-two. We cannot know which if any of these numbers represent Chaucer's "forty years and more." We may consider the probabilities in relation to other facts of his life. The age of forty-one in 1386 is wholly improbable for Chaucer, since his birth year would then have been 1345, and he would have been only fourteen when arming for the campaign of 1359 and only fifteen when he bore letters from Calais to England, as discovered by M. Delachenal.¹ The age of forty-four, the next in general probability, is also to be preferred to forty-three or forty-two on all grounds. It is more reasonable to believe Chaucer was at least seventeen when arming for the campaign of 1359, than that he was fifteen or sixteen.

But may Chaucer have been older than forty-four in 1386? It has already been implied, in the first quotation from Professor Young, that modern census tables show a concentration on multiples of five as well as multiples of ten, though the concentration is much more frequent in the latter than in the former case. In the census of 1890, 354,388 in excess of the correct number concentrated upon forty years of age, while a little more than half as many in excess of the correct number, or 204,800, concentrated upon forty-five.² Perhaps little is to be inferred from these figures directly. Yet if Chaucer had been forty-four years or under in 1386 the probabilities are great that he would have been

¹ *Histoire de Charles V*, II, 241.

² In the same census the concentration on thirty was more than twice as great as on thirty-five, that on fifty more than three times as great as on fifty-five. The figures in excess of the corrected ones for thirty and thirty-five are 390,509 and 181,114; for fifty and fifty-five, 359,598 and 73,824.

satisfied with the acknowledgment of forty years of age. If in 1890, as has been shown above, every third man who was forty-one, forty-two, forty-three, or forty-four reported forty years, it would not be strange if Chaucer, five centuries ago, should have been willing to do the same. His testimony to "forty years and more" is not proof that he was more than forty-four years of age. It does lend color to the idea that he may have been forty-five or a little more, and yet have reported as he did. If he were forty-four in 1386 he would have been born in 1342. If his testimony to more than forty years means anything in the light of modern statistics, he may easily have been born in 1341 or even in 1340.¹

For practical purposes it is not necessary to support the validity of Chaucer's testimony. To say that he was born about 1340 is ordinarily sufficient. Yet to see in the testimony to his age in 1386 a fairly valid statement of fact is pleasant, because the impression left by Chaucer's works and what we know of his life is that of a more than usually accurate man, even of an exact man for his time.² His employment on many and important missions of diplomacy lends color to this idea. In the article above mentioned, Mr. Moore has added valuable proof of the poet's business ability, as shown by his long tenure of the controllership of customs, compared with the terms of other incumbents.³ Even his works give evidence of the accuracy of the man in more ways than one. He twice recorded, in a manner we can hardly suppose accidental, the particular day of the month when he had the vision of the *House of Fame*. The *Lines to Adam Scriven* indicate his insistence on exactness in recording his verses. His references to his sources, when understood as he intended, are usually correct, as my colleague Professor Hulme suggests. His exactness in referring to the appearance of the planet

¹ In the interest of extreme exactness it should be noted that Chaucer may have been only forty-five when testifying in the Scrope and Grosvenor trial of 1386 and yet have been born in 1340, as he reckoned it. This would have been true if the date of his birth had fallen between December 15, 1340, and March 25, 1341. Or, if he had been born in the latter half of December, he would have still been only forty-five in 1386 and have been born in 1340, as we reckon it. Either of these possibilities would make it easy to interpret his "forty years and more" as a fairly exact statement of his age.

² I do not forget Professor Lounsbury's criticism of Chaucer for certain minor inaccuracies in his works; see *Studies in Chaucer*, II, 177-88, 416-26. Yet the number mentioned is small compared with the many allusions in his work as a whole.

³ See pp. 14-19, and especially p. 18.

Venus in the *Parliament of Birds* has been fruitful in dating the work. The similarly exact allusions to time in the *Canterbury Tales* are of unusual value for the same purpose. The whole of the *Astrolabe* gives proof of an exact mind, a mind inquisitive and acquisitive of what we should call science, today.

In one case, it is true, we might apparently accuse Chaucer of error in a fact about which he must have had some accurate knowledge. Curiously enough this concerns the age of a prominent man with whom the poet was more or less intimately associated. In the *Book of the Duchess* (l. 455) Chaucer gives the age of John of Gaunt as "four and twenty" instead of nine and twenty as it should have been. This has been explained, it is true, as a possible error of xxiiij for xxviii by the loss of v in copying.¹ Yet such explanation has always seemed to me less likely than that Chaucer was purposely flattering the young prince by an understatement of his age. In either case, however, we have good reason for not assuming a mere inaccuracy on Chaucer's part. Still, if Chaucer's understatement of John of Gaunt's age was for purposes of flattery, we have something akin to the understatement of ages by witnesses in the Scrope and Grosvenor trial. It may indicate a common tendency of the time. If, then, Chaucer's emphasis of forty was an understatement of his own age as much as he understated that of John of Gaunt in the *Book of the Duchess*, we should again reach the conclusion that he was about forty-five years old in 1386.

Yet it is better to arrive at this conclusion through such interpretation of Chaucer's testimony as I have made in the body of this paper. That interpretation assumes Chaucer's statement to have been intended as accurate, since we have no evidence to the contrary. It then explains his testimony as to his age in the light, not of statements by a few others of his own time who may or may not have given their own ages correctly, but of general tendencies among people of all nations today, tendencies likely to have been more, rather than less, pronounced five centuries ago.

OLIVER FARRAR EMERSON

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

¹ Mr. Brock's suggestion, noted by Professor Skeat.

MONTGOMERIE AND THE FRENCH POETS OF THE EARLY SIXTEENTH CENTURY

Alexander Montgomerie's borrowings from Ronsard have been traced by Dr. Oscar Hoffman¹ and by Dr. Rudolf Brotanek.² Interesting along the line of this influence on Montgomerie is the fact that his imitations and adaptations extended, also, to the French poetry of the earlier half of the sixteenth century—particularly to that of Clément Marot. The following passages will sufficiently substantiate this relationship.

Montgomerie's "The Elegie" is an adaptation of Marot's Elegie III:

Now, since the day of our depairt	Puis que le jour de mon depart arrive,
appeirs,	C'est bien raison que ma main vous
Guid resone wald my hand to you	escrive
suld wryt	Ce que ne puis vous dire sans
That whilk I cannot weill express but	tristesse,
teirs;	C'est asçavoir: Or adieu, ma mais-
Videlicet: "Adeu! my Lady vhyt."	tresse;
Adeu, my love, my lyking, and	Donques adieu, ma maistresse hon-
delyt,	orée,
Till I returne; for whilk I think so	Jusque au retour, dont trop la
lang,	demeurée
That absence els does all my bouells	Me tardera; toutesfois ce pendant
byt:	Il vous plaira garder un cueur
Sie gredie grippis I feell befor I gang,	ardant,
Resave, vhill than, a harte lyke for	Que je vous laisse au partir pour
to mang,	hostage,
Quhilk freats and fryis in furious	Ne demandant pour luy autre ad-
flamnis of fyre;	vantage
Keep it in gage, bot let it haif no	Fors que veuillez contre ceulx le
wrang	deffendre
Of sik as may perhaps his place	Qui par desir vouldront sa place
desyre.	prendre.
This is the summe of that whilk I	S'il a mal faict, qu'il en soit hors
requyre:	jecté:

¹ "Studien zu Alexander Montgomerie," *Englische Studien*, XX, 1895.

² *Untersuchungen über das Leben und die Dichtungen Alexander Montgomerie*, Wien und Leipzig, 1896.

If it has ocht offendit, let it smart;
 If it be true, then let it haif the hyre.
 Oh! wold to God ye might behold
 this harte!
 Quharin a thousand things ye suld
 advert:
 Thair suld ye sie the wound vhlk ye
 it gave;
 Thair suld ye sie the goldin deadly
 darte;
 Thair suld ye sie, hou ye bereft it
 haiv;
 Thair suld ye sie your image by the
 laiv;
 Thair suld ye sie your hevinly angels
 face;
 Thair suld ye soon my permanence
 persaiv;
 Thair suld ye sie your name haif only
 place;
 Thair suld ye sie my languishing,
 alace!
 Four our depairt: bot since ye knou
 my painis,
 I hope, if ye consider weill the case,
 And spyis the teirs vhlk over my
 visage rains,
 If in your breist sik sympathie
 remanis,
 Then sall ye suffer som thing for my
 saik.
 Quhair constant love is, aluay it con-
 stranis,
 In weill or wo, coequall pairt to take;
 Lyk as my members all, begins to
 quake,
 That of your duill the half I do
 indure,
 Quhilk I suppose ye for my absence
 mak.
 Then haif no dout that any creature
 Can dispossesse you of my hairt, be
 sure,

S'il est loyal, qu'il y soit bien traicté.
 Que pleust à Dieu qu'en ce cueur
 peussiez lire
 Vous y pourriez mille choses eslire.
 Vous y verriez vostre face au vif
 paincte;
 Vous y verriez ma loyaulté em-
 praincte;
 Vous y verriez vostre nom engravé,
 Avec le deuil qui me tient aggravé
 Pour ce depart; et en voyant ma
 peine,
 Certes je croy (et ma foy n'est point
 vaine)
 Qu'en souffririez pour le moins la
 moytié
 Par le moyen de la nostre amytié,
 Qui veult aussi que la moytié je sente
 Du deuil qu'aurez d'estre de moy
 absente.

N'ayez donc peur, deffiance ne
 doute
 Qu'autre jamais hors de mon cueur
 vous boute.
 Je suis à vous, et depuis ma
 nayssance
 Du feu d'amour n'ay eu tel' cong-
 noissance;
 Car aussi tost que la Fortune bonne
 Eut à mes yeulx monsté vostre
 personne,
 Nouveaux soucy's et, nouvelles pen-
 sées
 En mon esprit je trouvay amassées.
 Tant que (pour vray) mon franc et
 plein desir
 Qui en cent lieux alloit pour son
 plaisir,

Nor yit remove from you my constant mynd.

Since I am yours, quhom love culd not allure,

Sen I wes borne, till nou that I enclynd

To you allone, for whom my hairt is pynd.

Of lovis fyr, befor, I nevir kneu,

Nor yit aquent with Cupid in this kynd;

But look! how soon gude fortun to me sheu

Your sweet behaviour and your hevinly heu,

As *A per se*, that evir Natur wroght, Then uncouth cairis in me began aneu,

Both in my spreit and in my trublit thocht:

My libertie vhillk I in bondage broght,

Sa that my frank and frie desyre, or than,

Ane hunder places for my plesur soght,

And ay sall do, whill I am leving man.

Sall ye then, after our depairt, forget That vhillk is yours, and change on na wyse can?

Hou soon myn ee no sight of yours culd get,

It weeping said: "O deidly corps, defet!

Quhair bene these lamps of light, these cristall ees,

Quhillk maid us ay so mirrie when ve mett?"

Quod I agane with sighing voce: "Thou sees,

Thocht thou for dolour under shadou dees.

En un seul lieu s'arresta tout à l'heure,

Et y sera jusques à ce qu'il meure.

Oublierez vous donc après ce depart Ce que est vostre ? hélas ! quant à ma part,

Dès que mon oeil de loing vous a perdue,

Il me vient dire: "O personne esperdue,

Qu'est devenue ceste claire lumiere Qui me donnoit liesse coustumiere?"

Incontinent d'une voix basse et sombre

Je luy respons: "Oeil, si tu es en l'umbre

Ne t'esbahy: le soleil est caché, Et pour toy est en plein midy

couché,

C'est asçavoir, ceste face si claire Qui te souloit tant contenter et

plaire Est loing de toy." Ainsi, m'amy et dame,

Mon oeil et moy sans nul reconfort d'ame

Nous complaignons, quand vient à vostre absence,

En regrettant vostre belle presence.

Be not abaised, suppose thou haif no
sight.

Thy sun is hid, and keeps no more
degrees;

Bot for thy sake, goes to at none, for
night;

That is to say—that hevinly visage
bright,

Quharon thou wont thy fantasie to
feid,

Is far fra the; vhairthrou thou laikis
thy sight."

So, lustie Lady, well of womanheid!
Myne ee and I but comfort ar indeed,

And do bewaill thy wofull absence ay.
Regrating you, my wounded hairt
does bleed

And than I think, when I am far
auay,

Leist that, meintym blind Love suld
thus assay

All meins he nicht, by craft or yit
ingyne

To open his blindit ees, that they
Might clerelie see these gracious ees
of thyn;

And so, beholding sik a sight divyn,
His mynd, to love the, shortly suld
be moved;

And caus me, at ane instant, for to
tyne

The thing quhilk I sa lang and leall
haiff lovd.

Be ye not constant, when ye sall be
provd,

Love sall overcome your honest
ansueirs all;

That ye sall think, to yeild, it you
behovd:

Love is so slie; vhaiss fairdit language
sall

Peirce and get entrie throu a stony
wall.

Et puis j'ay peur, quand de vous je
suis loing,

Que ce pendant Amour ne prenne
soing

De desbander ses deux aveuglez
yeulx

Pour contempler les vostres gracieux
Si qu'en voyant chose tant singu-
liere

Ne prenne en vous amytié familiere,
Et qu'il ne m'oste à l'ayse et en un
jour

Ce que j'ai eu en peine et long sejour.

Certainment, si bien ferme vous
n'estes,

Amour vaincra vos responses hon-
nestes.

Amour est fin, et sa parolle farde
Pour mieulx tromper: donnez vous
en donc garde,

Car en sa bouche il n'y a rein que
miel,

Mais en son cueur il n'y a rien que
fiel.

S'il vous promect et s'il vous faict le
doulx,

Respondez luy: "Amour, retirez
vous:

<p>I wish you, thairfor, with him to be war: His mouth is hony, bot his hairt is gall. On kitlest huiks the sliest baits they ar. If he the heght, or slielie drau the nar, Thou ansueir him: "Go, Love, reteir the hence; For I love one who hes my hairt so far, He merits not to tyne him, but offence."</p>	<p>J'en ay choisy un qui en mainte sorte Merite bien que dehors moy ne sorte."</p>
---	--

The French poem has seventeen additional lines, which I do not quote, as they have no parallel in the Scotch; however, it will be seen that Montgomerie's tendency is to expand what he takes for his model.

The first stanza of Montgomerie's "An Admonition to Young Lassis" has almost an exact parallel in Marot's Epigram LXVIII ("De Oui et Nenny"). Montgomerie continues with two additional stanzas in much the same strain. These I do not quote.

<p>A bony "No," with smyling looks agane, I wald ye leirnd, sen they so comely ar. As touching "yes" if ye suld speik so plane, I might reprove you to haif said so far. Noght that your grant, in any wayis, might gar Me loth the fruit that curage ocht to chuse; Bot I wald only haif you seme to skar, And let me tak it, senyeing to refuse.</p>	<p>Un doulx Nenny, avec un doulx soubrire, Est tant honneste, il le vous fault apprendre: Quand est d'Oui, si veniez à le dire, D'avoir trop diet je vouldroys vous repandre; Non que je soys ennuyé d'entre- prendre D'avoir le fruiet dont le desir me point; Mais je vouldrois qu'en le me lais- sant prendre Vous me disiez: "Non, vous ne l'aurez point."</p>
--	--

The rhyme scheme in both these poems by Montgomerie is the linked quatrain, the second consisting of two quatrains only—*a b a b b c b c*, and the first, of continuously linked quatrains—*a b a b b c b*

c c d c d. . . . This is the rhyme scheme of twelve more of the "miscellaneous poems," and, with the terminal couplet, is that of the sonnets. I have noted over one hundred examples of this linking, in Marot—enough to establish it as a very characteristic form. There are to be found occasional examples of the two linked quatrains in English poetry from the time of Chaucer, but it is only in Spenser that it is used extensively, and in his sonnets we find, first, the continuous linking. Dr. Hoffman¹ thinks Montgomerie's sonnet form original with him and noted by Spenser in the examples occurring in James VI's *Essays of a Prentise*. Stevenson² says the priority must rest with Montgomerie, but thinks the forms independent developments. Since both poets borrowed from Marot's material, is it not highly probable that he is a common source, also, for the idea of continuous linking?³ In no case, however, does Marot close his linked quatrains with the couplet.

There is good evidence that Montgomerie was experimenting with the various intricate interior rhymes of the *grands rhétoriciens*, thus going back to French poetry of the first quarter of the century.⁴ Instances follow of Montgomerie's use of all these different rhymes. The fact that he tried so many seems proof positive that he was consciously imitating. All the references which follow are to Dr. Cranstoun's edition of Montgomerie, unless otherwise given.

Rime renforcée: Caesura rhymes with the end of the line.

Quhilk armes on far so uglie ar,
And ay convoyd with Dolour and with Dvil,
That Hope nicht skar, if they come nar,
And fray ane hairt perhaps out of his huill.

Melancholie, Grit Debut of Despair, p. 171.

See, also, "Banks of Helicon," p. 273; "The Cherrie and the Slae"; "Love, if Thou List," p. 160; "He Bids Adeu to His Maistres," p. 189.

¹ In his "Studien zu Alexander Montgomerie," *Englische Studien*, XX, 1895.

² In his supplementary volume, 1910, Introduction, xlvii.

³ R. E. Nell Dodge, in the Cambridge Spenser, and C. H. Herford, in his edition of Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*, suggest Marot as the source of Spenser's linked quatrains.

⁴ For a discussion of these interior rhymes see L. E. Kastner, *History of French Versification*, Clarendon Press, 1903.

Rime batelée: end of line rhymes with caesura of next line.

Stay, Passinger, thy mind, thy futt, thy ee:
 Vouchsafe, a *we*, his epitaph to *view*
 Quha left but *fue* behind him, sik as *he*;
 Syn leirnd to *de*, to live agane *aneu*.
 "Epitaph of the Maister of Work," p. 221.

See, also, "Flyting," p. 61; "Poet's Legacy," p. 170.

Rime brisée: Caesura rhymes with caesura.

When ye wer *pleisit* to pleiss me hertfully
 I was *appleisit* to plieiss yow sicklerly;
 Sen ye ar *pleisit* an vyir me,
 Be nocht *displeisit* to pleiss quhair pleisit am I.
 "When Ye Were Pleisit," p. 279.

Rime enchaînée: last word of one line repeated at first of next line.

I wald se mare nor ony thing I *sie*;
 I *sie* not yit the thing that I *desire*;
Desire it is that does content the *ee*;
 The *ee* it is vhlk settis the hairt in fyre.
 "Sonnet to James Lauder," p. 109.

See, also, "Sonnet to Issobell Yong," p. 110.

Rime en écho:

Quhat lovers, Echo, maks sik querimony? Mony,
 Quhat kynd of fyre doth kindle their courage? Rage
 Quhat medicine, (O, echo! knowis thou ony?) Ony?
 Is best to stay this Love of his passage? Age.
 "Echo," p. 138.

Rime senée: all words of each line begin with the same letter. Instances of this in Montgomerie are too numerous to require particular illustration. Alliterative verse was, of course, common with the Scotch poets.

The tendency to combine these forms, which the *rhétoriciens* carried to an absurdity, is also evident in Montgomerie:

Rime renforcée and *rime batelée*:

Remember rightly, when ye *reid*,
 The woe and *dreid*, but hope to *speid*,
 I drie into dispair.

My hairt within my breist does *bleid*
 Unto the *deid*, without *remeid*;
 I'm hurt, I wot not vhair.

"He Prayis to His Maistres for Pitie," p. 197.

Rime renforcée and rime brisée:

Polwart, yee *peip* like a mouse amonst thornes;
 Na cunning ye *keepe*; Polwart, yee *peip*;
 Ye look like a *sheipe* and ye had twa hornes;
 Polwart, ye *peipe* like a mouse amongst thornes.

"Flyting," p. 59.

See also: "Redolent Rois, My Onlie Shois" (p. 208, supplementary vol.¹); "Grund The on Patience" (p. 213, supplementary vol.²); "I Hoipe to Serve" (p. 217, supplementary vol.³).

Dr. Brotanek suggests that this interior rhyme is the result of an indirect Italian influence; but the French influence seems clearly to be more immediate and more probable.

LOIS BORLAND

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹G. Stevenson, *Poems of Alexander Montgomerie*, Supplementary Volume (Scottish Text Society, 1910).

²*Ibid.*

³*Ibid.*

A NEW LIGHT ON THE SONNETS

Sitting in the old-fashioned garden which takes the place of Shakespeare's last home in Stratford, I was running through a volume of the Sonnets which I had just bought of the bookseller now established in the house where Judith Shakespeare went to live after her marriage. I came to the line, "So I, made lame by fortune's dearest spite," in the thirty-seventh sonnet. A thought struck me. I turned to sonnet eighty-nine and read "Speak of my lameness and I straight will halt."

A lame actor! True Malone, Dowden, and other critics had argued that lameness is used metaphorically. There is a possible chance for such an interpretation of the second quotation, but common-sense rebels against applying it to the first, and even in the second a literal lameness is much more consistently indicated. The context shows that the lameness was a deformity, one of the physical defects which the writer admits in his despair and self-pity.

Other critics explain that it was probably a slight, a barely perceptible lameness, and that Shakespeare was probably cast for old men and other slow-moving characters. But the records give him as a *principal* actor, and his brother Gilbert remembered him as the Ghost in *Hamlet*. I pictured to myself the original production. I imagined the actor saying, "See! It stalks away!" and then seeing a lame ghost *hobble* across the stage. Is it possible, I asked myself, that the author would permit his scene to be broken up by the absurdity of a limping specter?

I looked at the sonnets again. The writer insists that he is "bated and chopped with tann'd antiquity" (Sonnet LXII). But we know from the contemporary allusions of Meres and from other undeniable evidence that the sonnets were written while Shakespeare was in his thirties, perhaps before. Surely this is not at "the twilight of such day as after sunset fadeth in the west" (Sonnet LXXIII). And these inconsistencies having appeared, others introduced themselves. Why the insistence at one time that the suitor is without artistic skill (XXIX), at another boasting of his

verses (LXXXI)? Why the querulous, senile, unmanly attitude contrasted with the wonderful smoothness, nobility, and power of the poetry? And why finally, why above all, the dedication to Mr. W.H., "the onlie begetter of these ensuing sonnets"? If the young lord who was the sonneteer's rival was William Herbert, earl of Pembroke (and there are many arguments against it), he would still not be the "onlie begetter," for the verses are addressed partly to the woman in the case. And why Mr. W.H.? If a cypher or an alias is required, would the publisher fail in the servility which never forsakes the Elizabethan bookseller by robbing his patron of his title? Something is clearly wrong.

Then suddenly came this thought. Have not the commentators in their eagerness to preserve the only ostensible bit of autobiography left by the poet, overlooked the obvious fact that the sonnets were written *by Shakespeare for some one else*—for this senile, lame Mr. W.H., who simply paid the young poet to write love-letters for him in the fashion of the period, exactly as he accuses his rival sonneteer (LXXXVI) of doing?

Now the other enigmas begin to solve themselves. Read the sonnets one by one in this new light and you will see the drama. In Sonnets one to seventy-six inclusive, an old man (LXXII and LXXIII), ugly, poor, friendless, without artistic skill or influence (XXIX) fawns upon a younger one, fulsomely praising his looks and merits and urging him to marry. Why is he so anxious that his friend should wed?

This friend (who like himself is named William, as appears by CXXXV and CXXXVI) has won from him the woman he loves (XLII), and although young Will, as we may call him, expresses sorrow (XXXV) for his conduct he continues to keep old Will out of his mistress' favor. Now old Will knows that he is powerless with the usual weapons against so brilliant a rival. To anger young Will can have the effect only of making him indifferent to the wrong he has done and old Will realizes the desperateness of his case. Appeals to young Will's sense of honor then must be the program, united to a very subtle scheme.

Young Will is unmarried. He is rich, powerful, handsome, probably a nobleman (XXXVII). The woman is not beautiful as

the time regards beauty (CXXXI) (CXLI), nor chaste (CXLII). Having been the mistress of this lame, insignificant, old man, she cannot be a woman of young Will's class, so old Will knows that young Will is not likely to marry her and that young Will's marriage to some other woman will put an end to the rivalry and give old Will a chance to come back to favor. Hence the first group of sonnets addressed to young Will.

Old Will, though claiming much for the verses which he has inspired, makes no pretensions to literary skill. He envies young Will's ability in that direction, first in an impersonal manner (XXIX), then directly (LXXXV), and then in a more malicious tone, hinting that young Will, pretending to write his own verses, was really, like himself, aided by another (LXXXVI). But old Will must meet his rival where he can. Young Will sends love poems to the lady (LXXXIII). They may or may not be original. But old Will can, hiring Shakespeare and throwing doubt upon the authorship of young Will's tributes, secure perhaps an advantage.

This he does, and while appealing to young Will through that poetic form of which young Will is himself so fond, he at the same time sends to the woman a series of sonnets, the first accompanying the gift of a notebook or diary (LXXVII).

The first group (I to LXXVI) is a unit by itself. The first twenty-six are ingenious exercises in superlative praise in the artificial Elizabethan manner. The terms of endearment are laid on with a trowel purposely, it seems, to keep the good-will and arouse the remorse of the young rival, while at the same time they subtly suggest to others a reaction from all this sweetness and an impression of effeminacy on the part of the object. The marvelously turned phrases hide all but the obvious motive, but watchfulness will discover the other two in every line.

Then in XXVII we get a suggestion of complaint which deepens in each succeeding section until XXXV. The accusation, though made in terms of painful tenderness or whining timidity, is perfectly clear—young Will has robbed old Will of his mistress. Then something happens. The verses suddenly break into a weak and agitated sonnet (XXXVI), the last two lines of which are copied from another (XCVI) addressed to the woman. Then they burst

into louder laments and clearer reproaches to XLII. With XLIII and the following sonnets we perceive that old Will has gone away from young Will and his mistress, gone somewhere. We find out the reason at the end of LVIII.

I am to wait, though waiting so be hell,
Not blame your pleasure, be it ill or well.

Old Will has been induced by young Will's promise to go away for a while, perhaps on the representation that young Will is repentant (XXXV), and will try to undo the mischief he has brought if old Will promises not to interfere by his continuous appeals and complaints. Old Will believes, also, that absence will raise something like jealousy in the woman (CIX). So Will, the elder, goes to the country and waits. He grows tired of waiting (LXIV, LXVI) interspersing the expression of his impatience with more extravagant praise of his rival (LXIII, LXV to LXIX). He hints that people tell him that the affair is not being broken off (LXX); grows melancholy and hopeless (LXXI, LXXV), reminding young Will that there is not much time left for him to enjoy the reward he has been promised.

In the meantime he has been writing and sending sonnets to the woman. They begin with LXXVII and run on in a strange mixture of adoration and detraction as if he feared the lady would think herself too good for him. He is afraid to attack the younger lover, hoping still that the prize may be turned over to himself. Still he gradually allows a bitter note and a sarcastic tone to slip in (LXXXVI), and as hope fades away his honeyed praise of her changes to peevish scolding (LXXXVIII, LXXXIX, XC). More sarcasm (XCI) and more scolding (XCII to XCVII) and the same fear of approaching death (XCII), and then a softer, tenderer, more genuine set of spring memories (XCVII to XCIX).

Then another shift of the course. He invokes his muse to sing again the praise of the noble youth who has evidently done something which pleased the venerable Pantaloon very much. What can it be except that he has left the woman and gone to other fields, leaving her to be wooed back to her original swain? From C to CVIII he sings his gratitude to his "sweet boy" (CVIII).

With CIX he addresses the woman again. He announces his return. He promises that his appetite he never more will grind "on newer proof to try an older friend" (CX). It thus appears that his exile was for the purpose (the double-edged humor of young Will's advice is seen) of making the woman jealous. But though he directs his verse at her in confident style (CIX to CXV), she admits impediments and principally his age, for he answers these objections in one of the finest of all the sonnets (CXVI) and protests that his love has not changed (CXVI to CXXIV). One suspects that to get rid of him she affects to believe that during his absence he has been false to her.

Then another catastrophe happens. Young Will again appears on the scene and the intrigue shows signs of being renewed. Old Will half-heartedly sends another warning that young Will had better marry before he grows too old (CXXVI), and then resumes his sour sweet epistles to the darkly fair beauty (CXXVII to CXXXII). But alas! The nobleman is soon firmly re entrenched in Love's stronghold, and nothing is left for the Pantaloon but to beg for the dregs of her affection (CXXXIII to CLII) and peevishly upbraid her until at last (CLII) he impotently relinquishes her altogether.

The last two sonnets are obviously not connected with the drama—mere fanciful conceits, stuck on, probably, so that the collection may be complete.

We may now read the dedication and realize that "the only begetter of these insuing sonnets Mr. W. H." is old Will, the man who ordered and paid for them and perhaps can still be induced to pay something toward the perpetuation of his romance—not Lord W. H. nor Lord H. W. nor any lord, but a plain bourgeois commoner as we expect to find him.

But no more of identity. And nothing of the Herbert-Fitton or the Southampton or Sidney Lee's literary exercise, or any other theory. This is not a synthesis, nor a stretching of the poems to fit over some specific external fact. It is merely the bare statement of what appears from the internal evidence to one whose profession it is to discover from the verbal expression of others the facts of their lives and experience in a given case.

This is the story seen by the light of the first premise. That it robs us of what we thought was an autobiographical record is not

really deplorable, for it also erases the stains upon Shakespeare's character as established by the pure moral tone of the plays—stains of sycophancy, of querulousness, even of homo-sexuality. True, the theory here presented, if correct, indicates that Shakespeare in a mercenary spirit was satisfied to cater to the senile and caddish desires of a weak old man, but the consistent financial purpose is no novelty in the estimate of his qualities.

A real loss is the reduction of the sonnets from genuine expressions of feeling to mere hack writing; still we have left to us the marvelous phrases, the profound generalizations, and occasionally a burst of emotion which we feel must be real and personal and oblivious of the mercenary task.

WILLIAM M. BLATT

BOSTON, MASS.

A SHAKESPEARE CRUX

A Shakespeare crux of long standing is the passage in *All's Well That Ends Well*, IV, ii, 38, in which Count Bertram, seeking to persuade Diana to yield her honor to him, is answered by her thus:

I see that men make rope's in such a scarre,
That wee'l forsake our selves.

Although the passage cannot compare with the famous "runawayes eyes" of *Romeo and Juliet* in the amount of discussion evoked, it is a good second to *Hamlet's* "dram of eale" in the number of emendations it has suffered. Doubtless the temptation to emend has in this case been peculiarly great because of the large number of similar words that can be substituted for "rope's" and "scarre." Thus, among something like thirty emendations that have been proposed, are "hopes in such affairs," "hopes in such a scene," "hopes in such a cause," "hopes in such a war," "slopes in such a scarre," "ropes in such a staire," etc., some of which have from time to time been adopted. Conservative editors of the present time mostly preserve the folio text, as above, letting the crux stand; some of them regard it as hopelessly corrupt. Dr. Ingleby once adopted the word "rope-scarres" as a family name by which to designate an entire class of "corrupt idiotisms."

As long as we have amateur editors we shall probably have emendations, but critics of experience have mostly learned the lesson that the solution of these difficulties is nearly always to be found, not in emendation, but in the text as we have it. Certainly in this case nothing more is required than the omission of the apostrophe from "rope's." A "scarre" ("scar," "scaur") meant, up to Shakespeare's time, a bold rock or crag—such a crag, for instance, as Dumbarton Castle stands on—and the figure here is the sufficiently familiar figure of the rock or fortress of a woman's honor, which men, with arguments and persuasions, attempt to scale and so enforce a surrender. Compare *Lucrece*, 481:

Under that colour am I come to scale
Thy never-conquered fort.

Diana pretends to be yielding, for her very next words are a demand for the ring which she knows Bertram will not part with on any lesser terms. The ring being at first withheld, she refuses to capitulate, in language which keeps up the figure:

Thus your own proper wisdom
Brings in the champion Honour on my part,
Against your vain assault.

Thereupon Bertram gives up the ring as the price of conquest.

Be it observed further that in the early part of the play there is a passage running thus (I, i, 123):

Helena: Man is enemy to virginity; how may we barricade it against him?

Parolles: Keep him out.

Helena: But he assails; and our virginity, though valiant, in the defence yet is weak: unfold to us some warlike resistance.

Parolles: There is none [etc.].

It is true, this particular discussion between Parolles and Helena is not altogether above the suspicion of having been interpolated. But there is another passage even more apposite. It is found where Helena is addressing the mother of Diana (III, vii, 17):

The count he woos your daughter,
Lays down his wanton siege before her beauty,
Resolved to carry her: let her in fine consent [etc.].

Clearly, Diana's words to Bertram, when the crisis comes, are an echo of this very figure.

If the intruded apostrophe in "rope's" needs accounting for, there are several places in the same column of the Folio text from which it might have fallen out and been wrongly replaced—the word "Tis" some lines above, or the elided "is" in "Mine Honors such a Ring" below (in the next column an apostrophe is found in a similar elision of "is," "When his wife's dead"). It is more likely, however, that the apostrophe is due either to some blot on the manuscript copy, or to a mere inadvertence on the part of the typesetter such as occasioned the omission of the apostrophes in the two cases just cited.

The use of ropes in actual escalade is several times alluded to by Shakespeare. Indeed, the very situation which has furnished the metaphor in our text is literally and circumstantially described in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*:

Valentine: Ay, and we are betroth'd: nay, more, our marriage-hour,
With all the cunning manner of our flight,
Determined of; how I must climb her window;
The ladder made of cords; etc. (II, iv, 179).

Proteus: Know, noble lord, they have devised a mean
How he her chamber-window will ascend,
And with a corded ladder fetch her down;
For which the youthful lover now is gone,
And this way comes he with it presently (III, i, 38).

Valentine: What lets but one may enter at her window?

Duke: Her chamber is aloft, far from the ground,
And built so shelving, that one cannot climb it
Without apparent hazard of his life.

Valentine: Why, then, a ladder, quaintly made of cords,
To cast up, with a pair of anchoring hooks,
Would serve to scale another Hero's tower,
So bold Leander would adventure it (III, i, 113).

Juliet describes Romeo's resort to ropes in similar phrasing (*Romeo and Juliet*, III, ii, 132):

Take up those cords. Poor ropes, you are beguiled,
Both you and I, for Romeo is exiled.
He made you for a highway to my bed,
But I, a maid, die maiden-widowed.

For the use of a rope on a scar may be cited the description of the samphire-gatherer in *King Lear* (IV, vi, 15):

Half way down
Hangs one that gathers samphire.

"Make ropes" might seem to be an inexact phrase for "make ropes into a ladder" or "make a ladder of ropes," but observe that precisely the same form of expression is employed in the passage cited from *Romeo and Juliet*: "Poor ropes, you are beguiled . . . He made you for a highway to my bed." Manifestly "ropes" is used as the equivalent of rope-ladder, or the entire scaling-apparatus. Moreover, in the present passage the word is used metaphorically for Bertram's cunningly woven arguments, and the expression would offer no difficulty even without this parallel. For "in such a scarre," where later usage would incline toward *on*, compare: "For in thy shoulder do I build my seat" (3 *Henry VI*, II, vi, 100); "Or in the beached margent of the sea" (*A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, II, i, 85).

Finally, the phrase "that we'll forsake ourselves" so obviously means "that we'll abandon our better selves, give up our honour," that it scarcely needs illustration. Yet there chances to be an exact equivalent of this in *The Rape of Lucrece* (148-57):

So that in venturing ill we leave to be
The things we are for that which we expect. . . .

Such hazard now must doting Tarquin make,
Pawning his honour to obtain his lust;
And for himself himself he must forsake.

It seems rather strange that so simple an explanation should not have occurred before. Yet I turned the passage over in my own mind many days, wondering whether Shakespeare knew anything of mountain-climbers tied together with ropes, or trying to learn whether ropes may not have been used along the cliff-walks of Scarborough, and the like, when finally the word "assault" in the context suggested the explanation here offered. Knight appears to have come nearest to it. His punctuation is puzzling, but he prints "ropes" as a plural and comments: "*Scaur* is still used for a precipitous rock in Scotland. Thus, figuratively, it may be used for a difficulty to be surmounted. Men, according to Diana, pretend to show how we can overpass the obstacle, by furnishing the ropes by which the rock is to be climbed." But Knight evidently had only a somewhat vague picture in mind, having missed the definite image of an assault by escalade.

ALPHONSO GERALD NEWCOMER

